

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXV

JANUARY, 1932

NUMBER 1

DID PETER DENY HIS LORD? A CONJECTURE

MAURICE GOGUEL

FACULTÉ DE THÉOLOGIE PROTESTANTE, AND ÉCOLE DES HAUTES
ÉTUDES, PARIS

FERDINAND KATTENBUSCH has said: "I am more convinced than most that in the investigation of the beginnings of Christianity a great many problems are likely to prove insoluble. But we have no right to acquiesce in that conclusion before all means have been exhausted, all possible combinations tried."¹ Following this suggestion I would here present some observations on Peter's Denial, and would propose an hypothesis.

The incident is narrated by all four evangelists (Mark 14, 54. 66–72; Matt. 26, 58. 69–75; Luke 22, 54b–62; John 18, 15–18. 25–27), with variations in detail that do not exclude a common origin for their narratives.² It is related on the one hand to a declaration made by Jesus (Mark 14, 26–31; Matt. 26, 30–35; Luke 22, 31–34; John 13, 36–38), and on the other, at least in the opinion of most critics,³ to the conversation which in John 21, 15–17 follows the appearance of the risen Christ at the sea of Tiberias and in which Jesus, after three times asking Peter whether he loves him, gave him the commission, "Feed my sheep."

These three incidents form, or seem to form, a cycle. Do they really belong to the same stratum of tradition, or can we distinguish in them primary and secondary elements? Before trying to answer this question and examining the mutual relations of the three pieces, we should look at each one by itself.

¹ F. Kattenbusch, 'Die Vorstellung des Petrus und der Charakter der Urgemeinde zu Jerusalem,' in *Festschrift für Karl Müller*, Tübingen, 1922, p. 324, n. 1.

² I may add that the allusions to Peter's denial in early Christian literature give no ground for supposing that there was any other tradition respecting this episode than that which we possess.

³ For instance, B. Weiss, Holtzmann, Loisy, Zahn, Heitmüller, W. Bauer, and others. The chief exception is Spitta, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, Göttingen, 1918, p. 18.

1. The denial foretold

Mark's story (Mark 14, 26-31) opens with a sweeping utterance of Jesus: All the disciples will be offended, that is, will lose their faith in him, or at least abandon him. Thus will be fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah (13,7): "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered." Then, after a pattern often found in the gospels, the prophecy of defeat is followed by a prophecy of victory. "But," Jesus continues, "after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee." To the prophecy of the dispersal of the disciples Peter replies that although all be offended, that is, abandon their Master, he will not abandon him, and this declaration calls out a second statement of Jesus, that even in that night, before the cock crow twice, Peter will deny him thrice. Peter protests that even if he should die with Jesus, he will not deny him, and the other disciples say likewise.

The account in Matthew (26, 30-35) shows only minor variations from Mark. The only departure that deserves mention is that Matthew speaks of but one crowing of the cock.

In this narrative three elements are to be distinguished:

(a) An announcement of the dispersal of the disciples, of which it cannot be said that it was of necessity originally made as the fulfilment of a prophecy.

(b) A saying about the return into Galilee, which, as it stands in the text, is a prophecy of the resurrection, but which Johannes Weiss⁴ holds to have had originally a quite different meaning.

(c) An announcement of Peter's denial, made in reply to a presumptuous affirmation by the apostle.

These three elements appear clearly related, but it may be asked whether this is not due to an editor's hand.

The announcement of the coming dispersal of the disciples corresponds perfectly to Jesus' situation on the last evening of his life and to the sentiments that he expressed in the course of the Last Supper by his distribution of the bread as symbol of his body given for his followers and by the cup as pledge of their

⁴ Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen, 1917, p. 12.

reunion in the Kingdom of God. The terms of this announcement do not stand in any necessary relation to the way in which the dispersal is presently told by Mark (14, 50) and by Matthew (26, 56). This is a reason for not regarding the announcement of the dispersal as a prophecy made up after the event. Nevertheless, the quotation from the Old Testament which is added betrays the purpose of minimizing the fault of the apostles by showing that their flight had been foretold by the prophets as a part of the plan of redemption. We must, therefore, admit at least an editorial modification of the form of the announcement of the dispersal.

The words *προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*, which Mark (16,7) understood as a prophecy of the appearance of the risen Christ in Galilee, can in themselves be taken in the sense assigned them by Johannes Weiss. They might, that is to say, represent a fragment of a tradition according to which Jesus told his disciples that as soon as he had accomplished his purpose in Jerusalem, he would lead them back to Galilee. A situation appropriate to such a saying as Weiss supposes is obviously not inconceivable. But it would be more than strange that, while all recollection of it has been crowded out by another version of Jesus' Jerusalem ministry, a trace should nevertheless have survived in the form of his announcement that he would return to Galilee at the head of his disciples. We cannot, therefore, attribute to the saying any other meaning than that given by Mark, and must see in it merely an editorial element intended to prepare for the story of an appearance of Jesus in Galilee.

In Luke (22, 31) Peter alone is addressed by Jesus, who says to him, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired you that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." The announcement of the denial is then introduced by a declaration of Peter that he is ready to go with Jesus both into prison and to death.

This narrative is not homogeneous. The first saying of Jesus to Peter is an exhortation to vigilance, not a prophecy of denial, and it is strange that Jesus' prayer that Peter's faith fail not should be immediately followed by the prophecy that this faith

will fail. The contrast is softened, but not removed, by calling up the part that Peter is later to play. Behind the text of Luke a tradition can be discerned in which Jesus, foreseeing the coming crisis, has told Peter that, succored by the effect of his Master's prayer, he would have to strengthen his brethren. This tradition appears to have directly reflected the part actually taken by Peter in the events which followed the death of Jesus and which resulted in the establishment of the church.

In Luke there remains at least a trace of the announcement of the dispersal of the disciples, in the fact that Jesus says 'Satan hath desired to sift *you* [plural],' although he is addressing Peter alone.

It is possible to suppose that Luke omitted the announcement of the dispersal because this was associated in Mark with a promise that the risen Jesus would appear in Galilee. But this explanation is not sufficient, for in Luke's account of the arrest of Jesus, he does not say that all the disciples fled. This difference from the other evangelists is too striking to be accidental. Can Luke have thought the complete dispersal of the disciples to be incompatible with the fact that, according to the denial story, Peter followed Jesus afar off when he was brought to the high priest's house? A slight alteration would have been enough to make the story consistent. Luke is not unaware of the dispersal of the disciples, for he mentions no one of them as present at the trial, the execution, or the burial, but he leaves it to be inferred. For this he may have had two reasons. The first is that his account of the resurrection assumes more definitely than the parallel accounts that the disciples were present and assembled in Jerusalem on the morning of the third day; this is not in accord with the idea of a complete dispersal. The second is that the veneration in which, from an early time, the apostles were held in the primitive church must have been attended with a certain difficulty from the behavior attributed to them at the moment of their Master's death. Mark and Matthew, as we have seen, reduced the offence by pointing to the fulfilment of a prophecy. John covered the flight of the disciples by the saying of Jesus (18,8) to those who arrested him, "If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way"; and he calls attention

to the fact that herein is accomplished the Lord's saying, "Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none" (18, 8-9). The Gospel of Peter (c. 26) intimates that the disciples were constrained to go into hiding because they were sought for as malefactors who intended to fire the temple. Luke passes by the dispersal in silence. His method is different, but his purpose is the same. The apologetic tendency, however, is stronger in Luke than in other evangelists. Taken as a whole, his account must be deemed secondary.

In the Fourth Gospel the announcement of the denial of Peter is introduced by Jesus' declaration that he is to leave his own, and that whither he goes they cannot come (13, 33). Peter asks him "Whither goest thou?" and receives the reply, "Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards," a transparent allusion to the future martyrdom of the apostle and an extenuation of the fall soon to be foretold through a reference to the fidelity whereof he will later give proof. Here is to be seen the same apologetic tendency as in Luke. Peter replies, "Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake." Then Jesus says: "Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily I say unto thee, the cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice."

Although John speaks here only of Peter, yet he knew of the prophecy of the dispersal of the disciples, since he says (16, 32), "Behold, the hour cometh, yea is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone." But John may have known the saying about the dispersal from a tradition in which it was not yet associated with the prophecy of the denial of Peter; and that John is here dependent on an earlier tradition follows from an observation made by Corssen.⁵ In chapter 13, the disciples, or at least Peter, understood that Jesus had announced his own death. Later on (14, 5) Thomas's saying, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest," shows that they have not understood this.

If the terms of John's narrative are not derived from Mark, nevertheless the substance of his account includes nothing that

⁵ 'Die Abschiedsreden Jesu in dem Vierten Evangelium,' Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VIII, 1907, 142.

may not have been derived from that source, and there is no reason to suppose that John used a special tradition of his own.

In Mark's narrative there are two elements. One relates to the disciples, who will not support the test to which they are to be subjected; the other concerns Peter, and is more definite. What is foretold is not a flight but a denial. It is not impossible that the juxtaposition of the two parts is due to an editor. The relation between the prophecy and its fulfilment is not quite the same in the two cases. The correspondence is not direct between the words, "all ye shall be offended . . . the sheep shall be scattered" (Mark 4, 27), and the phrase in which the dispersal of the disciples is stated, "they all forsook him and fled" (14, 50). Moreover, since the quotation from Zechariah 13, 7 is at least subject to the suspicion of having been added under the influence of prophetic exegesis and with the desire of excusing the disciples, the only words that can be considered original, "all ye will be offended," do not in themselves contain any indication of time or circumstances to show in what the failure of the disciples will consist, or how it will be manifested. The announcement of the dispersal need not, therefore, be regarded as a prophecy *ex eventu*; if it were such, it would have been more definite.

The case is not the same with the announcement of the denial. Here the correspondence is complete. The prophecy and the account of its fulfilment stand in dependence on one another. Either Jesus is said to have foretold that Peter would deny him because, the apostle having actually done so, it seemed impossible that Jesus should not have foreseen and foretold it, or else, Jesus having uttered a despondent saying on the ease with which his boastful disciple might deny him in case of danger, it was thought that what he had said must have come to pass, and that Peter had actually denied his Master. The first of these two suppositions seems to have all the probabilities in its favor. Perhaps the second has not been considered with as much care as it might be, and it will be worth while to look at the situation which would exist if it were accepted.

2. *The denial*

According to the three Synoptics, when Jesus is led away after his arrest Peter follows at a distance. He enters the high priest's palace and sits down beside the fire with the servants. Mark and Matthew open in this way a story of which they reserve the sequel until later, after having described the appearance of Jesus before the Sanhedrim and the outrages upon him. The second part of the story of the denial begins abruptly, without indication in either gospel of the precise moment of the event.

Luke narrates the denial in one piece, at the beginning of the story of the night in the high priest's house. He does not connect it with Peter's entrance into the palace, but his account does not differ essentially from those of Matthew and Mark. In all three accounts, a maid-servant, seeing Peter in the palace, says to him that he was with Jesus. According to Mark and Matthew, Peter gives an evasive answer — “I do not know what you mean.” In Luke, his affirmation is more explicit — “I know him not.” Later, according to Mark and Matthew only, Peter goes to the porch of the palace as if he were going out. Mark adds that at this moment the cock crew.

The second denial is not told in exactly the same way in the three Synoptics. According to Mark and Matthew, it took place at the gateway of the palace; according to Luke, in the same place as the first denial. In Mark it is the same servant who says to those who stand by, “This man is one of them (*ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν*),” that is, ‘He belongs to the band,’ a somewhat surprising expression, since Jesus alone has been arrested and he is to be tried alone, and there is no question of accomplices or of a search for accomplices.⁶ A second time Peter denies his Master, but in what words we are not told. No increase in intensity is indicated. In Matthew, on the contrary, another maid-servant

⁶ The only passage which suggests a search for accomplices of Jesus is in the Gospel of Peter (!). “They sought us as malefactors, as having tried to burn the temple” (26). This cannot be regarded as evidence, by reason of the relatively late date of the document and of its purpose to excuse the apostles for concealing themselves.

enters the scene;⁷ she says to the bystanders, "This man was also with Jesus of Nazareth." Peter's second denial is more explicit. He declares with an oath, "I do not know the man." Matthew has thus purposely given an increased emphasis to the denial. In Luke this scene occurs in the same place as the former one and with the same witnesses. Luke may have wished to show how Peter found himself bound by the stand he had already taken, or perhaps (a simpler explanation) he found it inconsistent that after Peter has gone to the gate as if he were intending to go out, he should again be in the middle of the court. But this time it is a man who speaks to Peter, saying, "Thou art also of them." Peter replies, "I am not." Thus in Luke, as well as in Mark and Matthew, the second denial follows immediately after the first.

According to Matthew and Mark the third denial follows close upon the first two (*μετὰ μικρόν*). Luke says that between the second and the third about an hour elapsed. He seems to have wanted to prolong the duration of the scene. This was necessary because in his account the story begins earlier than in Mark (from the moment when Jesus is brought to the house of the high priest) and still has to end at cock-crow. Mark and Matthew do not define exactly the spot where the third scene takes place. In their accounts Peter is questioned by the bystanders; in Luke, by only one of them.⁸ This time the charge is more emphatic and is supported by proof. "Surely," it is said, "thou art (*Luke*, he was) one of them (*ἐξ αὐτῶν*; *Luke*, with him). Thou art (*Luke*, he is) a Galilean." For this last phrase Matthew uses another, "Thy speech bewrayeth thee" (that is to say, 'thy accent'). The purpose is to explain how Peter came to be recognized as a Galilean. According to Mark and Matthew Peter affirms with oaths and imprecations that he does not know this man. According to Luke he replies simply, "I know not what thou sayest." Luke has thus tried to extenuate Peter's offence as he had already done in the scene of the proph-

⁷ This may be due to the fact that Matthew did not understand how the maid, who was at first at the entrance of the house, should afterwards be inside.

⁸ Luke may have thought that the words reported could hardly have been spoken by the whole group at once.

ecy of the denial, where he made Jesus speak of Satan sifting the disciples and brought in a mention of the conversion and subsequent loyalty of the apostle.

When Peter has spoken, the cock crows (for the second time, says Mark).⁹ Peter recalls what Jesus has said, and goes out and weeps.¹⁰

This analysis, I think, shows that, apart from the question of arrangement, there is no reason for assuming any source for Luke's account other than Mark.

In John, the movement of the story (divided into two parts, as in Mark and Matthew, by the examination of Jesus)¹¹ is much clearer. Peter follows at a distance, with another disciple whose name is not given. As I have tried to show elsewhere,¹² the passages of the Fourth Gospel which introduce a disciple who, though playing an important and very personal part, is left unnamed, show various characters. In some there is a definite indication, equivalent for the writer and his first readers to an individual designation. It is "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the disciple who, at the Last Supper, was leaning on his breast. In other passages the anonymity is complete and certainly intentional, for to avoid the proper name the author has had recourse to an artificial mode of reference. We receive the distinct impression that the evangelist's sources contained a proper name, and that it was that of the apostle John. In the case before us it is not said that the companion of Peter was the beloved disciple, but in the mind of the author he was very probably the apostle John. The unnamed disciple is *γνωστός* to the high priest, which need not mean a family connection but

⁹ Luke adds that the Lord turned and looked at Peter. This is a detail which Mark and Matthew would not have omitted if they had found it in their source. It must, therefore, have been added by Luke.

¹⁰ Mark has ἐπιβαλών ἔκλαει. The meaning of ἐπιβαλών is obscure. Among suggested explanations are: 'covering his head (with his cloak) he wept,' or 'he began to weep,' or 'remembering he wept,' or 'retiring into himself he wept.' It may be that the obscurity of Mark's phrase led Matthew and Luke to replace it by 'he wept bitterly.' It is possible also that ἐπιβαλών is a corruption of ἐξελθών, although this is palaeographically unlikely.

¹¹ In the Sinaitic Syriac version the denial is related in a single course, but the author of this version evidently worked the text over in order to remove inconsistencies.

¹² Introduction au Nouveau Testament, II, 323 f.

at least assumes that he had the entrée of the house. He goes into the palace and speaks to the portress to gain admittance for his companion who had stayed outside. When Peter in this way gains entrance, the portress asks if he is not a disciple of this man, which he denies. This story differs from those of the three Synoptics in that it explains Peter's entrance into the palace and that it assigns the first denial to the moment of his entrance.

After the interrogation of Jesus the story goes on as in Mark and Matthew, and makes no better connection than theirs with the intervening passage. The two later denials are told more briefly than in Mark. Peter is asked, "Art not thou also one of his disciples?" He denies it. Another servant, a kinsman of the one whom Peter had wounded, insists, "Did not I see thee in the garden with him?" Peter denies again and immediately the cock crows.

In this second part also John's account is more natural and better connected than that of Mark. Possibly John was struck by the obscurities and difficulties of the Synoptic account, and in order to avoid them invented the story of the disciple known to the high priest, who introduces Peter into the palace, together with the resulting circumstances. Or he may have reproduced a tradition which Mark had only in an altered form that had lost the connections between the different elements. I have elsewhere¹³ pronounced (as does Johannes Weiss¹⁴) in favor of the second explanation, but I am now inclined rather to adopt the first.

John's characteristic indifference to probability and coherence in his narratives does not, it is true, justify us in supposing that he was troubled by the obscurities in Mark's account, and we cannot be positive that there was not among the disciples of Jesus one known in the house of the high priest. That would be hard to reconcile with the Synoptic account of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem, but there are strong reasons for thinking that the Synoptists do not give us a true view of this ministry, and that Jesus' activity in the Holy City lasted longer

¹³ Les sources du récit johannique de la passion, Paris, 1910, pp. 82 ff.

¹⁴ Das älteste Evangelium, Göttingen, 1901, p. 301.

than they represent and did not end in complete failure. It is by no means impossible that on the eve of the passion there were some inhabitants of Jerusalem in the circle of his intimate disciples.

But John's narrative may have had a quite different motive. John assumes that one of the disciples stayed at the foot of the cross (19, 26), and this is of great importance in his eyes because it gives him the personal testimony of an eye-witness for the blood and water that came forth from Jesus' side, pierced by the spear (19, 34-35). The tradition, which is always favorable to the apostles, could not have spoken of Jesus as abandoned by all his disciples if at least one of them had stood by him, so far as this was possible, to the end. The idea of the disciple acquainted with the high priest may have been invented to explain the presence of a disciple at the foot of the cross. The obscurity which it dissipates by explaining the entrance of Peter into the palace of the high priest may very well be only apparent. We do not know how strictly the door was guarded, nor whether it is really inconceivable that under cover of the confusion some one who was neither a servant of the house nor an officer of the temple might have slipped in. On the other hand John has created a peculiar difficulty. If the unnamed disciple was a familiar visitor at the house of the high priest, would not his sympathies be known there? and if no offence was taken in his case, why should the same sympathies have been made a reproach to Peter?

There is another incident in John which may well be brought into relation with this one, because there too we find Peter and the unnamed disciple side by side. It is the account of the visit of the two disciples to the tomb after Mary Magdalene had found it empty (20, 2-10). The unnamed disciple is said to have seen and believed. Since nothing similar is said of Peter, we can only suppose that the sight of the empty tomb was not enough to convince him of the resurrection. The evangelist certainly wanted to indicate in this way a superiority of the other disciple over Peter, an entirely moral superiority, however, which did not exclude Peter's primacy, since he went in first into the tomb.

In giving a part, even a small one, to the unnamed disciple at the house of the high priest, the fourth evangelist may have had a similar purpose, to show that Peter was not alone in daring to follow Jesus afar off. This timid sign of attachment to his Master had been given by John also. That explains why the unnamed disciple is mentioned only at the beginning of the story, and why only a negative superiority over Peter is attributed to him.

The narratives of Mark and John are both divided into two parts, and in each the second part begins abruptly, without the slightest attempt to make a connection between it and what precedes; but in Mark the break comes after the entrance of Peter into the palace, in John, after the first denial. John's arrangement, which is certainly more satisfactory, may be explained by a simple change of order on purely literary grounds. The only important point is that the break in the two accounts establishes a connection between them. There is, therefore, no sufficient reason for assigning to John's account any source other than Mark.

Let us now turn back to the difference in arrangement between Mark and Luke. In Mark, the break seems to be a purely editorial matter of order. It results from the evangelist's effort to weld together two accounts of different origins concerning the same incident. The method is analogous to that which we find in Mark 3, 20-35, where the account of Jesus' refusal to go with his family when they try to lay hold on him on the ground that he is beside himself, is cut in two in order to be combined with the accusation of the Pharisees, that Jesus cast out devils by the aid of Beelzebub, which is inserted between the two parts. If the break was due to the combination in the source of the questioning of Jesus and the denial of Peter, there would be some connective or transition between them, but this is entirely lacking. The presence of a break in John's narrative may be taken as proving that the fourth evangelist knew the story of the denial only in conjunction with that of the questioning of Jesus, and consequently that he had no other source than Mark.

It may be that the obscurities and incoherences of Mark's

narrative, which is the oldest that has come down to us, can be explained by the hypothesis of a simpler tradition developed and added to until it included several denials whereas originally it had only one. Or we may suppose that several parallel traditions were joined in a series instead of being combined in one.

The account as given by Mark presents, indeed, material as well as psychological difficulties. Mingling with the servants and officers, Peter is suspected of being a disciple of Jesus. When questioned, he gives a negative, or evasive, answer. What conduct on his part would naturally follow? The suspicions aroused by his presence may have been allayed by his replies. But can he be certain that they are banished and will not reappear, or that other persons whom he may meet in the high priest's palace may not also put embarrassing questions? Since Peter has not had the courage to declare himself for Jesus, his only course is to get away as speedily as possible. The narrator seems to have understood this, for he says that Peter went out into the porch. It is physically and psychologically inexplicable that directly afterwards he should be found in the hall. Furthermore, the phrase used for his departure is a little strange: ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον (14, 68). What follows shows that the *προαύλιον*, where the second denial took place, is still in the palace of the high priest, and although the verb *ἐξῆλθεν* might conceivably be used to mean that he went to the front part of the house, yet, when enforced by *ἔξω*, it is surprising. Possibly this is merely editorial clumsiness; Mark, though not lacking in literary skill, is not impeccable. But the idea of editorial clumsiness can only be entertained if the account is otherwise coherent, which is not the case. Moreover, the fact that in Mark it is the same maid-servant who questions Peter, first inside the palace and then at the entrance, does not improve the matter.

The material and psychological obscurities which have here been pointed out would be easily explained if the account which we possess were the result of combining two independent traditions. According to one of these, Peter would have gone into the palace without hindrance, and, once there, would have been questioned, have disavowed Jesus, and departed. According to the other, it would have been at the moment when he sought to

enter the palace that the maid-servant questioned him. The original story would have been simpler than ours, and a combination of several parallel versions, with perhaps some tendency to dramatize the incident, would have made it more complicated. The fact that in all four gospels Jesus foretells a triple denial is not a decisive objection to this hypothesis, since "deny me thrice" may originally have signified merely 'deny absolutely.' In that case, a desire to make the relation closer between the prophecy and the event, under a literal interpretation of 'thrice,' may have influenced the development of the story.

What is the value of the tradition of Peter's denial in the house of the high priest? The story must first be examined by itself, without regard to its relation to the prophecy. Exegetes commonly remark on its psychological verisimilitude, and it cannot be denied that whoever put it into shape understood well the character of a headstrong, impulsive man. But this does not prove the historical trustworthiness of the story. A product of the imagination may be strikingly correct in its psychology. A strong correspondence is often pointed out, and not without some justification, between Peter's conduct in the palace of the high priest and his procedure later at Antioch in the presence of those who came from James (Gal. 2, 11 ff.). But though Paul is a sincere and veracious witness, he is not without prejudice. There is no reason to question the facts that he gives, but we are not bound to accept his interpretation of the motives of the men of whom he speaks. Upon Peter's conduct at Antioch an interpretation quite different from Paul's can be put, if we study carefully the circumstances in which Peter was placed. He was faced by an insoluble problem. If, in the presence of the partisans of James, he had persisted in the attitude he took before their arrival, he would have scandalized them and caused trouble and division in the church at Jerusalem. The harm thus done would have been quite as serious as the evil his actual conduct caused among the gentile Christians at Antioch. Peter may have been imprudent in taking a position without first fully estimating its consequences. Perhaps he did not foresee the coming of the partisans of James and the consequent embarrassment to himself. But he was not a hypocrite, and his

conduct at Antioch is in no way comparable to that attributed to him in the stories of the denial.

Accordingly we have no right to appeal to this necessarily conventional and arbitrary notion of Peter's character, any more than we should have to say that the man who wrote (or under whose name someone wrote) the beautiful exhortations to fidelity under persecution in the First Epistle of Peter could not have denied his Master.

For hesitating to ascribe an historical character to the tradition of the denial, several reasons present themselves. In the first place, the story as we have it is not adjusted to its context, but merely inserted into it. A second reason is that earlier than the Gospel of Peter there is not the slightest trace, except in this story of the denial, of any concern whatsoever on the part of Jewish or Roman authorities about disciples that Jesus may have had.

A third difficulty is the impossibility of discovering any connection between the denial and the disciples' flight. I do not mean a psychological relation, for it would be by no means impossible that after having fled Peter should recover himself and try to rejoin his Master, if it were only to find out what was going to happen to him. The difficulty is of another kind. If Peter had made an effort which proved that he was not entirely without interest in Jesus, and still more if John, as the Fourth Gospel indicates, had also followed his Master into the high priest's house, could it have been said, in spite of the respect in which the apostles were held, that they had scattered in cowardly flight? From these observations we draw but one conclusion, that the credibility of the episode of the denial is at least debatable.

3. The conversation of Jesus and Peter on the shore of Lake Gennesaret (the rehabilitation [?] of Peter)

After the meal which the risen Jesus had taken on the shore of Lake Gennesaret with his disciples, who have made under his instructions a miraculous draught of fishes, Jesus addresses Simon Peter, and pointing to his companions asks him whether he loves him more than these. Peter answers, "Yea, Lord, thou

knowest that I love thee." Jesus replies, "Feed my lambs (*ἀρνία*)," and asks a second time, "Simon, lovest thou me?" Peter makes the same answer, and Jesus says, "Feed my lambs (*προβάτια*)."¹⁵ A third time he asks him, "Lovest thou me?" and Peter, grieved that Jesus should make the same inquiry three times, replies, "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee," and Jesus again replies, "Feed my sheep."¹⁵ Then Jesus continues with a phrase which is incontestably a prophecy of Peter's martyrdom. Afterward, when Peter asks as to the fate reserved for the beloved disciple, Jesus makes a reply which gave rise to a legend that this disciple should never die. The evangelist takes pains to make clear that this was not what Jesus said. The stories of Jesus' appearance in the scene of the draught of fishes and of his conversation with Peter do not contradict one another, but there is no organic connection between them. The conversation begins with the words, "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter." It has not previously been said that Jesus had left the group of disciples and had led Peter apart, although evidently in the mind of the narrator the conversation of the two is without witnesses. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as an organic sequel to the appearance and the meal.

To the following context the relation of this conversation is not easy to characterize. Jesus continues to talk to Peter, but the conversation takes another turn. There is, to be sure, a logical connection between the mission entrusted to Peter and the martyrdom foretold for him, but in the second part of the conversation a purpose appears of which there is no trace in

¹⁵ On the variation in the use of *ἀρνία* and *προβάτια*, which is not the same in all manuscripts, see F. Macler, 'Pais mes brebis,' *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XCIV, 1929, 17–29. I do not think that we should attach any importance to this variation, any more than it is right to seek a meaning in Jesus' use of *ἄγαπᾶν* in his first two questions and *φιλέν* only in the third, while *φιλεῖ* is found in all three replies of Peter and Peter is said to be grieved because Jesus thrice asked him, *φιλεῖς με*. The fourth evangelist does not attach great importance to the exact reproduction of words. Thus in John 3, 7 Jesus says to Nicodemus, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again (*δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*)."¹⁶ This precise phrase does not occur in what precedes, but in vs. 3 Jesus had said *ἴσαν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, and in vs. 5, *ἴσαν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὅδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*.

the first part, to make a comparison between Peter and the beloved disciple and to contradict a legend. The author would persuade his readers that if the beloved disciple had not, like his rival Peter, suffered martyrdom, this was not because he was inferior, but because the Lord had disposed otherwise. At the same time he combats the legend that the beloved disciple should not die.¹⁶

We can only conjecture the nature of this legend. For our present purpose it is enough to show that the author of John 21 intended not only to emphasize the mission entrusted to Peter but also to define the position of Peter in relation to the beloved disciple. The question arises, therefore, whether the conversation with Peter was not introduced solely in order to bring in what is said about the beloved disciple.

Jesus' question, the repetition of which so distresses Peter, not only reveals the desire to obtain from the apostle a formal declaration that will justify conferring on him a mission of special importance. It also betrays a doubt of the sincerity and depth of his feelings; it is capable of being understood as a mild reproach. Might not the denial explain this distrust which Jesus seems to feel? Almost all exegetes understand it so, and see a correspondence between the threefold denial and the three-fold declaration of affection that Jesus asks of Peter. It would be too much to say that this conversation is the rehabilitation of the apostle, for it contains no slightest suggestion that Peter

¹⁶ There are two principal hypotheses for explaining the origin of the legend that the beloved disciple would never die. It may be that for some reason, when this person had reached a very advanced age, he left the district in which he had lived and that thereafter nothing was ever heard of him there. In the absence of any news of his death it may have been imagined that he was living in some mysterious retreat, awaiting the end of the world. This would be comparable in a certain way to Hebrews 7, 1-3, where from the fact that Genesis mentions neither the parents nor the death of Melchizedek, it is inferred that he was 'without father, without mother,' and that he was to abide a priest to all eternity. Or the legend may have had its origin in the words of Jesus in Mark 9, 1, "Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Since it could not be admitted that a saying of Jesus had been proved false by the facts, it may have been thought that somewhere disciples of Jesus were destined to continue alive, and the favorite disciple would not unnaturally be among those so privileged. The second explanation seems to me preferable to the first, for the first is subject to the grave objection that the beloved disciple seems to have been originally an ideal figure.

had made himself unworthy of an authority which Jesus had conferred on him or of a mission that he had entrusted to him. We must not introduce into the Fourth Gospel what is said in the Synoptics about a mission given to the apostle by Jesus during his earthly ministry. Such a mission is inconceivable in John, because the disciples are capable of nothing so long as they have not received the Holy Ghost. There it is only the risen Christ who can say to his disciples, as he does in 20, 21-23, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This mission and this power Peter receives, like the others; there can therefore be no question of a rehabilitation.

But even if (what does not seem plain) the author of chapter 21 of John, in narrating Jesus' conversation with Peter, did have the denial in mind, and wished to show that this did not make impossible the primacy of Peter (that is, the fact that Jesus had entrusted to him the care of his flock), it would be by no means certain that the story was invented by the author of this appendix to the Fourth Gospel, or that in the source from which it might have been borrowed it already had the character which it was capable of assuming in our present text.

The scene with which this chapter opens is that of the appearance of the risen Jesus on the shore of Lake Gennesaret. In verse 14 this appearance is said to be the third. Now in chapter 20 three appearances are described: the first, to Mary Magdalene; the second, to the assembled apostles without Thomas; and the third, to the apostles including Thomas. It would be a mere subterfuge to say that the first appearance was not counted because Mary Magdalene, being a woman, was not a disciple in the strict sense of the word. Accordingly the final declaration, "This is now the third time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples" (21, 14), did not originate with the redactor of chapter 21. He has reproduced it mechanically, without perceiving its inconsistency with the story of which it purports to be the continuation.

On the shore of the lake are seven disciples, Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee, and two others whose names are

not given.¹⁷ Simon Peter says that he goes a fishing; the others accompany him. They go on board the boat but that night they catch nothing. In the morning Jesus is waiting on the shore, but the disciples do not recognize him. He asks if they have anything to eat, and on their negative response tells them to cast the net on the right side of the boat. They obey, and cannot draw the net in, so full is it of fishes. The beloved disciple says to Peter, "It is the Lord." Then Peter, who was naked, puts on his coat and throws himself into the water. The other disciples come to the shore dragging the net full of fishes. On land they see a fire lighted, with fish cooking on it and bread, and Jesus bids them bring of the fish they have caught. Peter comes out of the water and draws the net, which contained one hundred and fifty-three fishes, large and small,¹⁸ but nevertheless did not break. Jesus invites the fishermen to come and eat. They now know that they are in the presence of the Lord, but no one durst ask him, "Who art thou?" Jesus takes the bread and gives it to them, and likewise the fish.

It is hardly necessary to point out the inconsistencies in this narrative, they are so evident. Jesus' advice as to where to cast the net, after the disciples have said they have nothing to eat, implies that the purpose of the miracle is to provide the materials for a meal, and indeed, when the draught is made, Jesus says, "Bring of the fish which ye have caught." Yet when the disciples disembark they find a fire lighted and fish cooking on it, and bread, and this fish and this bread Jesus distributes to them.¹⁹ Peter's conduct is also contradictory. When the beloved disciple tells him that the mysterious stranger who has spoken to them from the shore is none other than Jesus himself, he puts on his coat as a gesture of respect and leaps into the

¹⁷ The author, as the sequel shows, means to include the beloved disciple. The reason why the names of the last two disciples are not given may lie in the editor's fixed practice of not indicating clearly the personality of this disciple.

¹⁸ The number has evidently some special significance, but it is not worth while to try to guess at it. If we should review all the interpretations that have been proposed (*Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, II, p. 292, n. 2), we should see how ill advised it is, not to say absurd, to insist on trying to understand somehow or other what the text does not say.

¹⁹ 'Fish' is in the singular in vs. 13.

water, evidently for the purpose of coming into the presence of the Lord before the others. Yet when he reaches land, he draws up the net, which, however, the disciples who remained in the boat appear to have done already.

In verse 12 Jesus' invitation, "Come and dine," seems to announce a meal; in verse 13 his gesture is the breaking of the bread.

There is here more than mere editorial oversight or additions intended to bring out more conspicuously the part of the beloved disciple, who is the first to recognize the Master, or of Peter, who shows the greater eagerness to go to meet him.²⁰ The condition of the narrative can be explained only by the combining of two different stories. One of these must have related a miraculous draught of fishes made by the disciples under the direction of the Master and followed by a meal. Given the obvious disproportion between the size of the draught and the meal, we may suppose that originally there was no extraordinary miracle. The story may only have been that after having toiled a long time without taking anything the disciples, by the advice of Jesus, decided to make a last cast of the net, and that this provided for the meal. It is to be noted that the existence in the Gospel of Luke (5, 4-11) of an episode of a miraculous draught of fishes shows that the story had already been transformed before it was inserted in the Fourth Gospel, and that in the original account nothing was said of Jesus as being risen from the dead. In the account in John 21, the interest is divided between the miracle of the fishes and the appearance of Jesus. By itself, this duality of interest is of course not enough to prove the story composite, but it furnishes a hint that should not be overlooked.

In the other story, the risen Jesus makes himself known to his disciples by breaking the bread with them, in a manner which recalls directly the episode at Emmaus. Yet it is not in quite the same line of development, since there is nothing about a long conversation of Jesus with his disciples before the moment when

²⁰ The rôles assigned to the two disciples are the same here as in the visit to the sepulchre. Peter enters the tomb first, but John alone believes.

he reveals himself to them. The materials for the meal seem there to have been provided by a miracle.²¹

The fact that a story of the appearance of Jesus associated with a fishing-scene is tacked on to the end of the Gospel of Peter suggested to Rohrbach²² that the story in John 21, 1–14 came from the lost conclusion of the Gospel of Mark. This hypothesis has had much vogue, but it involves too many unknown quantities to permit its acceptance. Therefore in comparing John's story with that of the miraculous draught of fishes in Luke (5, 4–11), we cannot assume that the miraculous draught was originally the story of an appearance. Critics are not agreed on the relation of the stories in Luke and John. Some²³ think that we have two entirely independent traditions. This thesis is untenable for those who do not admit the postulates of harmonistic exegesis. Others hold that the two accounts are derived from a common tradition which developed in two different directions.²⁴ Still others agree upon a direct connection between the two stories but divide on the character of the primitive tradition, some giving the preference to Luke and supposing that the author of the appendix to the Fourth Gospel transformed into an appearance of the risen Jesus a story that originally belonged to his historical ministry,²⁵ while others, on the contrary, ascribe the transformation of the episode to Luke.²⁶

²¹ A third difference is that in the account in John 21 Jesus does not disappear immediately after being recognized. This may be because the introduction of the conversation with Peter caused a change in the ending.

²² Der Schluss des Marcusevangeliums, der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon und die kleinasiatischen Presbyter, Berlin, 1892; Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu, Berlin, 1898. Rohrbach's theory has been accepted by many critics.

²³ For example, H. J. Flowers, 'The Calling of Peter and the Restoration of Peter,' Anglican Theological Review, 1922, pp. 235–239.

²⁴ For example, H. H. Wendt, Das Johannesevangelium, Göttingen, 1900, p. 229.

²⁵ Brandt, Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 401 f.; Klöpper, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1899, p. 357; Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Lucae, Berlin, 1904, pp. 14 f.

²⁶ B. Weiss, Das Johannesevangelium (Meyer's Kommentar, 8th ed.), Göttingen, 1893, p. 627; Beyschlag, Das Leben Jesu, Halle, I, 1893, p. 323; A. von Harnack, Lukas der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament, I), Leipzig, 1906, p. 158, n. 2.

The narrative of Luke is as follows. Jesus is on the shore of Lake Gennesaret, pressed by the crowd. Near the shore are two boats from which the fishermen have landed to mend their nets. Jesus goes into one of the boats, that of Simon, and asks him to push out a little from the shore; and from that position he teaches the crowd gathered on the beach. When he has finished, he tells Simon to take the boat out into the lake and cast his net. Peter answers that he has toiled all night without catching anything; however, at Jesus' word he consents to cast the net. The net breaks with the quantity of fishes caught. Peter then signals to his companions in the other boat to come and help him. They fill the two boats until they threaten to sink. Seeing the miracle Peter throws himself at Jesus' feet and says, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man," for, the narrator adds, at the sight of the miracle terror ($\theta\acute{a}\mu\beta\sigma$) had seized him as well as those who were fishing with him, together with James and John his partners. But Jesus says to Peter, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." Then they beach the boats and forsaking all follow him.

This account, though its inconsistencies are less noticeable than those we have pointed out in John 21, nevertheless cannot be supposed to have been written from a single conception. The connection between the teaching from the boat and the miracle of the draught of fishes is artificial. The interest, at first directed to the teaching, is presently diverted to quite a different subject. Nothing is said as to the teaching which Jesus gave, nor the effect which it produced.

The theme of teaching from the boat is found elsewhere. In Mark and Matthew it forms the setting for the teaching in parables (Mark 4, 1-34; Matt. 13, 1-35), but there too it is not presented in a very satisfactory form. For theoretical reasons Mark has interrupted the teaching given to the people in parables by instruction to the disciples in particular. This instruction is certainly secondary in relation to the parables themselves, and the words with which it is introduced (notably vs. 10, "When he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables") and the concluding statements (vs. 34, "Without a parable spake he not unto them; and

when they were alone he expounded all things to his disciples") are not consistent with the idea of Jesus as speaking from the boat.

Luke saw these difficulties and refrained from representing the parables as delivered from the boat (8, 4), but not wishing to give up so picturesque a scene he used it at the beginning of the story of the miraculous draught of fishes. What he says of James and John as companions of Peter (5, 10) makes the passage overloaded. The two expressions, "all that were with him" (vs. 9) and "also James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon" (vs. 10), form a doublet. Nor is it natural, after a sentence addressed to Peter alone, "henceforth thou shalt catch men" (vs. 10), that the next verse should say, using the plural, "they forsook all and followed him." The introduction of James and John and the transformation of the individual calling of Peter into a collective calling betray the influence of Mark, who describes the simultaneous calling of Peter, Andrew, James, and John (Mark 1, 16-20).

The narratives of Luke and John have in common that they both tell of a miraculous draught of fishes, made under the directions of Jesus, after a whole night of fruitless toil. In both of them, though more clearly in Luke, Peter is, if not the only person concerned, at least the chief one.

The purpose of the miracle is not the same in the two stories, however. With Luke, the object is to produce an impression of power which will make Peter respond to Jesus' appeal; it is a miracle of demonstration. With John — or, more exactly, in an older form of the story which can be discerned behind John's narrative — the object is to provide food for the disciples; it is a miracle of charity. It is easy to see how the few fishes necessary for the meal of a small group of fishermen should have been multiplied until they became the "hundred and fifty and three" of which John speaks (John 21, 11), or the "great multitude of fishes" which according to Luke filled two boats (Luke 5, 6-7).²⁷

²⁷ It is not important that Luke says that their net broke, while John says that in spite of the great number of the fishes the net did not break. The detail has the same significance in both cases.

So, behind the stories which we have, we discern a simpler tradition which may be represented as follows. One day when the disciples had toiled all the night without catching anything, and had nothing to eat, Jesus bade them make one more attempt, and this cast was crowned with success. In that form the anecdote may be entirely true to fact; and it is not surprising that the disciples should have seen in such a mere coincidence a demonstration of Jesus' supernatural power, and that the number of fishes should have been so exaggerated as to leave no relation between the draught and the meal. In Luke the very idea of the meal has disappeared; in John it appears only as a survival.

Two arguments have been advanced in favor of the priority of John's account. The first is that Luke might have transferred the episode to the early part of the gospel because he did not admit that there were appearances of the risen Christ in Galilee. This argument is a veritable begging of the question; it could be valid only if it could be established in advance that the miraculous draught belonged originally to the story of such an appearance. The second argument, presented by Harnack, is that Peter's exclamation in Luke, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," refers to the denial. This interpretation does not correspond with the text. The *θάμβος* which seized Peter is only the feeling of religious awe which man experiences before the manifestations of a supernatural power. It is stated to have been felt equally by the companions of Peter, who did not deny Jesus.

On the other hand, there are reasons for thinking that the story of the draught of fishes belonged originally to Jesus' Galilean ministry. In Luke it serves as introduction to the account of the calling of Peter, that is, of the mission entrusted to him. A trace of this connection survives in John, where the fishing scene is followed by the conversation at the end of which Jesus charges Peter to feed his flock. The gospel tradition has put the calling of the disciples and the institution of the apostleship in the first part of the ministry of Jesus. No doubt there are reasons for thinking that the gospel stories of the institution of the apostleship are only a reflection of the part played by Peter

and his companions in the period following the death of Jesus; but we need not take account of this circumstance here, for unquestionably the true origin and primary character of the apostolate were forgotten early. When the twenty-first chapter of John was written, no knowledge of the real facts survived.

The priority of the tradition represented by Luke is confirmed by the fact that in John 21 the miraculous draught is spoken of as the third manifestation of Jesus. We know only two other episodes that are numbered. In the Fourth Gospel, the miracle of Cana is referred to as "this beginning of miracles" (2, 11), and the healing of the nobleman's son at Capernaum is called "the second miracle" (4, 54). The miraculous draught, Jesus' third manifestation, must originally have belonged to the same tradition as these two, and have had its position after them. An episode, therefore, belonging to the beginnings of the Galilean ministry has been transferred to the period after the resurrection. The same line of argument is applicable to Jesus' conversation with Peter and to the mission of church government entrusted to him.

It is uncertain, as we have seen, whether the author of John 21 gave to Jesus' conversation with Peter the sense of a rehabilitation of the apostle, but in any case it is certain that in the source from which this episode is taken the conversation had quite another significance.

4. Conclusion

Here is the situation. It is represented that Peter denied his Master, and that the tears he shed on leaving the palace of the high priest were a sufficient atonement for this disloyalty. There was no surprise that, after having declared with oaths that he did not know Jesus, Peter, from the moment when the disciples came together again as a group, played a leading part and was the rock on which the church was built. At a time when the discipline of the community was strict, so that it was believed that the lying couple, Ananias and Sapphira, had been punished by death (Acts 5, 1-11), and when it was still remembered that Jesus had said, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him

also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8, 38), it occurred to no one that Peter's cowardly falsehood could have disqualified him. Paul, who does not hesitate to reproach Peter to his face with what he calls his hypocrisy, and who recalls the circumstance to the Galatians, Paul, for whom it was important to diminish Peter's authority in order to safeguard the integrity of the gospel in the churches of Galatia, did not mention this instance of weakness in his rival (Gal. 2, 11 ff.).

I am not unmindful that what we know of the history of primitive Christianity is not much. We have only the residue from a body of material once vastly richer; and especially in the passion and resurrection cycle Peter's denial on the one hand and the part he plays at the time of the resurrection on the other may have been merely two elements in a narrative that is only partially preserved. Originally there may have been some link between them, something that explained how it was that the denial did not prevent Peter from subsequently attaining the position that we know. This would be no isolated instance. The gospel tradition has preserved the remembrance that James the brother of Jesus did not believe in him during his ministry (Mark 3, 20–21.31–35; John 7, 5); yet at least from the year 44 James had an important activity in the church at Jerusalem and was its leader. The New Testament tradition has preserved no record of the circumstances under which the change in his attitude took place. But the case of James cannot be treated as parallel with that of Peter, for James seems to have played no part in the foundation of the church. He only comes upon the scene, so far as we know, after some fifteen years. Not to have believed in Jesus at first is quite a different thing from denying him after having believed, and the two cannot be compared.

If we add to all this the internal difficulties in the story of the denial itself, the fact that it is imperfectly connected with the narrative of the passion, and the further fact that it contradicts what is said of the flight and dispersal of the disciples, it is evident that the credibility of the episode is subject to a series of unrelated objections which are not outweighed by

the obvious difficulty of supposing that Peter's denial was created by the tradition without any foundation at all.

But in reality it would not have been a *creatio ex nihilo*. While there are difficulties in admitting that Peter denied Jesus, there are none in supposing that Jesus feared that Peter lacked the firmness of character necessary to assure his fidelity under strain. We may eliminate the denial as unhistorical, but there is no ground for rejecting the historical character of the prophecy of such a denial. Thus we reverse the hypothesis commonly entertained, that the denial gave rise to Jesus' announcement of it.

Suppose that Jesus, thinking of the dangers that threatened him, expressed on some occasion the feeling that in case of danger his disciples would abandon him. Suppose Peter protesting, and Jesus answering that in a moment of peril Peter himself would not wait for the cock to crow three times before denying him. If the tradition preserved the memory of these words, it is easy to understand how it could readily alter their character and see in them not the expression of a fear but a prophecy. What Jesus had foretold had necessarily to become a fact. To pass from the belief that Peter had denied the Lord to the complete narrative of such a denial was an easy step. Only, if ever, at a relatively late date, when John, chapter 21, was put into shape, would the need be felt of reconciling the tradition of the denial with the memory of Peter's subsequent career, and this belated reconciliation, if it took place at all, was imperfect, for it was assigned to a moment after Peter had begun to take a leading position.

This is, of course, only a conjecture, and is not susceptible of demonstration, but the idea that the prophecy is an outgrowth of the denial is itself only an hypothesis. The theory I have proposed seems to me to explain the texts and the facts better, and to take their peculiarities more fully into account. Hence it may be useful to bring it forward here.

THE USE OF NAILS IN THE CRUCIFIXION

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

“Ay, but you don’t so instigate to prayer!”
Strikes in the Prior: “when your meaning’s plain
It does not say to folk — remember matins,
Or, mind you fast next Friday!”

BROWNING, *Fra Lippo Lippi*.

THESE words in criticism of Fra Lippo’s vivid and realistic painting of sacred subjects admirably typify the attitude of theology to art. In the ages when the masses were still unable to read, the church took advantage of the work of the painter to impart instruction in the Bible stories. But after all, mere enlightenment is comparatively useless, sometimes even dangerous. It is always inferior to devotion. As long as the masses could be inspired by art to perform more fully their religious duties, so long was art rendering to the church the services that were its due. If the actual facts, even as recorded in the Scriptures, stood in the way of the theological object, they had to be neglected, obscured, or denied. If by a false depiction religious feeling were aroused, there could be no doubt as to the value of such depiction. As Fra Lippo impatiently puts it:

“For pity and religion grow i’ the crowd —
Your painting serves its purpose!” Hang the fools!

In no branch of religious art is this ecclesiastical purpose more dominant and, from the standpoint of historical accuracy, more unscrupulous than in the representations of the central act of the Christian drama, the crucifixion of our Lord. I shall discuss only one subdivision of this general subject in order to illustrate from one detail what a superstructure of theologically useful depiction has been built up on the slenderest of foundations.

Even a cursory inspection of the pictures of the crucifixion that one sees in any important collection of old paintings will

reveal that underneath the tedious sameness there is a good deal of variety. Not only do different artists emphasize different features, but from the earliest times to the sixteenth century a most interesting development can be traced.

Early crucifixions show the Saviour in no apparent pain, but often crowned and triumphant, not exactly hanging from his cross but rather standing in front of it. In the very earliest instances the cross is merely hinted at or is quite obscured. Somewhere about the thirteenth century the emphasis changes. The figure writhes, the face shows agony, blood flows profusely. Together with this the method of inflicting death grows in crudity, if not in cruelty. The spear-wound, historically inflicted after death, is used to increase the impression of suffering. A horrible thorn-crown replaces the royal crown or the rope-like wisp of mild bramble.

The depiction of the nails follows this general tendency. It is with this particular feature of the crucifixion that this paper chiefly has to do. I wish to discuss: (1) the development in art of the motif of the nails; (2) the reason for the stress laid in art upon this feature of the crucifixion; (3) the evidence for the use of nails in crucifixions, both from the New Testament and from other writings.

Probably the earliest¹ representation extant of the crucifixion of Christ is that on the wooden doors of the church of Santa Sabina in Rome. There is no cross, but the hands of the central figure, and of the side figures as well, are clearly nailed to the architectural background, apparently a stone wall into which the nails are driven. The figures merely stand on the ground, and I can detect no trace of nails in the feet. Often in the earliest crucifixions the feet show no nails.² A crucifixion on a sarcophagus in the Museo Bardini in Florence shows none, nor could I trace nails in a manuscript illumination in the Cluny Museum in Paris. In the famous Giotto crucifixion in the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua and in another by Lorenzo Monaco in the Jarves Collection at New Haven no nails can be

¹ I do not recognize a crucifixion scene in the Alexamenos graffito of the Museo delle Terme. But this graffito shows no nails.

² Maskell, Ivories, pp. 253 ff.

seen in the feet. When the nails are represented they are sometimes very small. In a manuscript of the four gospels, dating from the ninth or the tenth century, in the Medicean Library, appears a very cheerful Christ whose feet are pierced with minute nails. The British Museum exhibits a Latin sacramentary of the latter part of the twelfth century (MS. 16949) with very small nails in the feet. Occasionally, when the nails are invisible, their presence must nevertheless be assumed. Sometimes the thumbs cover the palms of the hands³ but nails are clearly implied. In such cases the feet show no nails and the position of the figure does not imply their presence. It may be that in these cases we have a survival of an earlier reluctance to depict nails. But if so, the artist has admirably succeeded in indicating an explanation of the omission.

The conventional representation of the crucifixion shows both hands and feet pierced with nails sometimes so long and so stout as to suggest house-nails or even ship-nails. Large-sized nails were necessary if reliance were placed solely on them to counteract the downward thrust of the body. In the earlier depictions this thrust is not felt. The victim stands on the ground before the cross. With the ninth century the figure leaves the ground and is elevated a few inches so as to stand on a footrest or *suppedaneum*. For such a device there is, I believe, no ancient authority, but for centuries the depiction of it was general. This was because, for some reason, the artist was reluctant to exhibit the device which we do find attested for relieving the strain on the extremities during the hours of the victim's agony. An *eculeus*, or crotch-support, projected from the upright of the cross and on its upper edge the sufferer sat. I have seen this represented in art only once, by Max Klinger in the Museum of Leipzig.

In fact the footrest itself goes out of vogue. From such a device as that depicted on the dated fresco (1011 A.D.) in the church of Sant' Urbano dei Caffarelli on the Roman Campagna — an ample board on which two people might well find room to

³ So on a Romanesque plaque of Belgian provenience in the Ashmolean Museum. It dates from the twelfth century. The same is true of an ivory in the Vatican collection. It depicts beneath the cross Romulus and Remus and the Roman wolf.

stand, the footrest shrinks in size and declines from the horizontal. It is tipped forward so that feet, unless nailed or tied to it, would slip from it and the position of anyone standing upon it would be very uncomfortable. The angle at which it tips is increased till finally it falls into the plane of the upright. It then either utterly disappears, as in the Roman cross, or is retained as a shorter crosspiece, as in the Russian cross, becoming one of three crosspieces, of which the lowest and the uppermost are survivals respectively of the *suppedaneum* and of the *titulus*. Sometimes the lowest cant to the spectator's right — a phenomenon alleged to be due to a tradition that the left leg of Jesus was longer than his right. This is quite on a par with other attempts so to depict him as to fulfil the prophecy that when we should see him there would be no beauty in him that we should desire him.

There is, of course, still another way by which a body might be supported on a cross. It might be fastened with ropes. These are commonly represented in the crucifixion of the thieves, of which more later. On the famous cross of Muredach of the early tenth century the crucified is depicted without nails and with ropes tied around the legs so closely as to suggest a high boot or puttee. With the introduction of the nail motif there passed away any reason for ropes. The ropes, however, survive on occasion and are given various motives. In the National Museum at Naples I found on the back of a settee a wood-carving of a crucifixion (3786). Jesus' feet were tied, and the ropes were then held taut while the feet were nailed. This representation, dating perhaps from the fourteenth century, would seem to be a transition from the use of the rope to the use of nails. In later pictures the rope is thrown around the body.⁴ In the Victoria and Albert Museum (Salting Bequest) may be found a piece of Limoges ware (2424–1910), doubtfully ascribed to Jean Poillené, showing the hands of Jesus nailed while the feet are tied. Here, too, we have a transition from the use of the rope to that of the nail, and it will appear, as we continue, that this method of fastening the victim has better authority

⁴ Stations of the Cross in Antwerp Cathedral. Fourfold ropes pass around the waist.

than any other representations of nailing, although, so far as I have been able to observe, its depiction is excessively rare.⁵

When the nails come to be used for hands and feet the number of the nails varies. Earlier representations show the feet placed apart with a nail driven through each into the footrest. That is, four nails are depicted. On archaizing modern crucifixions four nails are not uncommon. The references to the five wounds of Christ suggest feet nailed separately. But in modern times, at least, the orthodox number of the nails is three, the right foot being placed over the left and the two then fastened to the upright with one nail. Saint Helena is said to have discovered but three nails. As I stood before a crucifixion in the lower church of San Clemente in Rome and compared it with the orthodox type, one of the Irish monks remarked: "Only three nails were found, but possibly one had been lost."

I am inclined to think, however, that the dominant reason for the use of three nails is a symbolic and theological consideration. Three is a more obviously sacred number than four. It suggests the Trinity. It does more; by the use of three nails the artist can cross the feet, that is, make the sacred sign, which appears in so many minutiae of the crucifixion as soon as one begins to look for it. It is interesting and illuminating to see in how many ways the sign of the cross is worked into these sacred pictures. The loin-cloth makes it;⁶ the streams of blood on the upright of the cross make it;⁷ the head of the lance that pierced the side of Jesus assumes the cruciform shape.⁸

But it is the feet which most consistently, if not most clearly, assume a crossed position, sometimes quite extreme,⁹ as the type changes from the four-nail to the three-nail crucifixion. In the former the feet are sometimes brought so close together as to overlap, while remaining in general parallel to one another. In such cases it sometimes seems as if only three nails were em-

⁵ This piece seems to be as late as the sixteenth century, but it is very like an ivory from Berlin reproduced in the Ashmolean and dating from century XI-XII.

⁶ Raffaelino in San Spirito, Florence.

⁷ Follower of Jacopo di Cione, Jarves Collection.

⁸ I cannot tell where I have seen this detail.

⁹ In a Pesellino in the National Gallery in London (Room IV; 727) this is emphatically the case. See also a Daddi in the Fogg Museum at Harvard.

ployed, but on close inspection it is seen that the left foot, though concealed by the right, has its own nail. This is the case in a Rubens in the Philadelphia Art Museum. Or, conversely, only one nail is used when two seem necessary, for the nail, as depicted, can scarcely do more than graze the under foot.

At the next stage of development one foot exactly covers the other, the feet being parallel as before but no longer side by side.¹⁰ Sometimes the feet and legs are curiously twisted, so that it requires very close study to discover which foot is on top, the left knee being under the right while the right foot is over the left.¹¹ Or the left leg is under the right shin but the right foot is on top.¹² I suggest that the reason for this extremely unnatural, if not impossible, position is to secure thereby a crossed position, not only of the feet but of the legs. It also produces an added writhe of the body, and not improbably the two motives supplemented each other.

A very curious feature develops as the adoption of the three nails superimposes one foot on the other. The vast majority of artists represent the right foot on top. The exceptions are rather rare.¹³

It is quite uncommon to find the left foot over in Italy. I observed it in certain crucifixes of Spanish provenience. But in the shops near the Pantheon in Rome where objects of devotion are sold a very large proportion of the crucifixes exhibited this

¹⁰ A crucifixion of the Antwerp School shows this (National Gallery, London, XIX; 1088), and perhaps even better a French fifteenth-century crucifixion in the Fogg Museum.

¹¹ Window in Holy Trinity Church, Knaresborough, England.

¹² Fourteenth-century missal (Harley MS. 2891), National Gallery, London; Jarves Collection at New Haven, from the shop of Guido of Siena.

¹³ One of the most striking is an El Greco in the Johnson Collection in Philadelphia. El Greco repeats this feature occasionally. A painting in the Jarves Collection ascribed to a follower of Duccio manifests the same peculiarity. It occurs perhaps as frequently in England as anywhere. I observed it in the east end of Durham Cathedral and in St. Oswald's church in the same city. In St. Alban's Abbey each square Norman pillar has a crucifixion scene of the same type with the left foot over, and so far over that the two feet make a letter X. On the reredos of the high altar of Salisbury Cathedral the left foot is over, though the feet are nailed separately. A short three miles distant, in George Herbert's little church at Bemerton, a window shows the left foot over. Cf. Bowness church on Windermere. On a woodcut, dated 1440–1460, in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the left foot is over.

peculiarity. Is its occurrence in England due to any Spanish influence? I have searched for some explanation of the all but consistent superposition of the right foot, but have found nothing satisfactory. In fact I have scarcely found the phenomenon mentioned. It may have to do with the triumph of the good, the side of justice. In Last Judgments the saved are on the Saviour's right (Matt. 25, 33), and so is the repentant thief in pictures of the crucifixion.

In the position of the hands no such variety is possible. Very occasionally the two hands are brought together and nailed over the head to the crosspiece near the upright, but always with separate nails, as in the powerful Rembrandt in the Johnson Collection in Philadelphia. Or the nails may be driven through the wrists.¹⁴

It is a fact worth observing that in pictures of the crucifixion of the thieves a very different condition of things appears. Although, of course, the gospel accounts focus attention on the middle one of the three crucifixions, they afford no hint that the punishment was visited on the thieves and upon the Christ by different methods. The sufferings of Jesus being the central point of interest, it is natural that his cross should be made higher and that his clothing should be more ample. But it is noteworthy that his cross abandons the tree form, that its timbers are hewn, while those of the side crosses are often left in the round, sometimes with clear traces of the branches. It is even more curious to observe that the nails are very often absent from the side figures, their place being taken by ropes. I have already called attention to the use of ropes in earlier representations of the death of Christ, but the ropes continue to confine the thieves long after they have disappeared from the crucifixion of Jesus. Usually the thieves are confined hand and foot by ropes, though sometimes the victim has worked a hand or a foot loose.¹⁵ Sometimes, indeed, no attempt has been made to confine the hands; instead, the rope is passed around the upper arm and the lower arm hangs loose behind the cross, so that the sufferers hang by their elbows. Occasionally the hands of the

¹⁴ Antwerp Museum, No. 313, Rubens.

¹⁵ Antwerp Museum, No. 297, Rubens.

thieves are tied behind the back.¹⁶ In an etching by Frank Brangwyn the feet of the unrepentant thief actually project behind the cross.¹⁷

Though ropes are more frequently found than nails in the earlier representations of the thieves' death, and persist even into modern art, yet the nails are not infrequently depicted in such cases (as for instance in a crucifixion in San Clemente, Rome), confining at least the hands. How the feet were fastened I could not determine in this case. In the scene over the high altar of York Minster the hands of the unrepentant thief seem to be nailed. I have seen the thieves nailed through the wrists but with feet tied.¹⁸ A Dürer engraving in the British Museum depicts the thieves on truncated trees. The feet are nailed separately to sawn-off limb-stumps. Here the hands are free. In the open air Calvary near the Basilica of the Sacré Coeur in Paris the feet are nailed to the upright of the cross, but with one well above the other.

Without going further into these minor crucifixions, which, however, seem to have been but little studied from this point of view, I may remark that they are more conservative of old motifs than are the representations of the principal crucifixion, if we may rely on the literary evidence for the conduct of this type of punishment. The conservatism extends to the pictures of the way to Calvary. The handbooks of Bible antiquities tell us that the victim carried only the cross-beam of his cross to the place of punishment. Seldom or never is Jesus represented as doing this. Very occasionally the thieves are so depicted. Of the crucifixion proper it may be observed that the thieves are often crucified on a tree,¹⁹ or on a cross that by its unhewn timber²⁰ suggests a tree. It is almost a commonplace of Christian theology that Jesus hung on a tree, but the artist has always hesitated so to depict him. The dreadful curse that at-

¹⁶ In a French painting, dating from the last half of the thirteenth century, in the Wallace Collection in London.

¹⁷ Gallery of Modern Art, Rome.

¹⁸ London, National Museum, Room XV, 2922, Master of Delft.

¹⁹ A faience of 1544, Museo Naz., Palermo.

²⁰ I quote Veneto, Mus. Naz., Naples, 84011.

tached itself to "every one that hangeth on a tree" was a dreadful stumbling-block even to the comparatively illumined hearers of Saint Paul. Few have dared depict the Christ as Burne-Jones has depicted him amid the branches of the tree, in the apse of the modern Protestant church of Saint Paul Within the Walls in Rome.

Then, too, the amount of clothes worn by the thieves more closely approximates the stark nakedness of actual crucifixions. Sometimes they are quite naked;²¹ usually, however, a sort of jockey-strap is given them.²²

The thieves suffer on T-crosses, a shape that antedates the Roman cross, which became the conventional type in Western Europe. Their crosses retain the footrest after the central cross has already lost it.²³ The thieves are bound with ropes when Jesus is nailed. And when nailed, they sometimes have four nails, though only three are used to confine Christ.²⁴

The fact of the matter is, as the opening words of this paper indicated, that the pictorial arts represent the crucifixion rather to satisfy certain theological requirements than to show the actual method of the historical event. Crucifixion seems to have been originally one of those bloodless punishments which enable men to satisfy a superstitious horror of shedding blood, especially tribal blood, and at the same time to lengthen the victim's period of agony. At first the culprit was bound to an unlucky tree and left to perish of hunger, thirst, and exposure. As time went on, there was in all probability some employment of nails, and if it were desired to abbreviate the life of the sufferer, his legs might be broken. In either of these cases some little bloodshed was likely, if not actually unavoidable.

But theology in the Middle Ages demanded far more than this. The prevailing theories of the atonement held that Jesus saved man by the shedding of his blood, washing the sinner clean in the fountain of that blood. Without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sins. This is clearly stated by T. C. Edwards (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1888, p. 162):

²¹ Modern window of the north transept of Liverpool Cathedral.

²² Maître de la Parenté de la Vierge, Royal Gallery, Brussels.

²³ Dürer in British Museum.

²⁴ Dürer in British Museum.

"Without a copious stream, a veritable 'outflow' of blood (*αιματεκχυσίας*, ix. 22), both as ratifying the covenant and as offered in sacrifice, there was under the Law no remission of sins." A few drops of Christ's blood could scarcely be considered adequate as a substitute for such outpouring. Blood from a nail-wound was insufficient.

A detail in the Fourth Gospel seemed to furnish a way out of the difficulty. We are informed (John 19, 34) that blood and water issued at once from the side of Christ when the Roman spear pierced it. This is almost always depicted as a gush of blood — only rarely does the artist try to represent also the water,²⁵ which, besides the artistic difficulty involved, seemed useless for purposes of theology. It has been doubted if such a gush of blood could come from a dead body (how long it had been dead we have no means of knowing). But in fact the gospel says nothing of any gush. A few drops, as the spear was withdrawn from the wound, would fulfil all the conditions demanded by the gospel text, provided that the blood appeared at once (*ειθύς*) after the weapon was out.

But, even if there were a gush, difficulties still remain. In the first place, post mortem blood hardly met the conditions. Redeeming blood must be shed by a living being — it must contribute to the death by which men were to be redeemed. One way to meet the difficulty — a way often adopted — was to ignore the facts of the Johannine account and represent the wound as inflicted on a living and suffering Christ.²⁶ Those who adopted this method would naturally be extremely incensed by those who obstinately preferred to follow the gospel account and thus forego this precious device. It was far more than a mere artistic preference. In a sense, the salvation of man was at stake. And so we can perhaps understand why Viterbo fought and destroyed a rival town which persisted in depicting Christ on the cross with eyes closed, that is, a dead Christ, especially if, as seems likely, the heretics adhered to the old type of the still unwounded Christ.

²⁵ Unknown thirteenth-century artist, Pinacoteca Vannucci, Perugia.

²⁶ This is done already in the eleventh-century Byzantine crucifixion in the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum.

As we might expect, the artist responds only very slowly to the theologian's need of blood. In the earlier pictures, even after the artist has learned to depict a suffering Christ rather than the earlier triumphant figure, blood is depicted not at all or very sparingly. Mere traces of it appear around fingers and toes.²⁷ Probably the flagellation would cause more bloodshed than an ordinary crucifixion, and sometimes the crucified figure is made to show the bloody effect of the scourge.²⁸ But there seems to have been a feeling that bloodshed caused by what was after all only a preliminary of the crucifixion could not take the place of life-blood. Here again, what was to be emphasized was the blood that had caused the redeeming death. For perhaps the same reason very sparing use is made of the blood on the knees, the result of the traditional falling down on the way to Calvary. None of these falls is mentioned in any gospel account, but the Catholic Church includes them in the Stations of the Cross and Protestant pictures freely represent them. But the art of the crucifixion decides to make little use of either of these sources and falls back on the blood from the extremities and the side. In fact it is some time before the side-wound appears at all, as indeed it could not until the church was ready to depict a dead, not a dying, Christ.²⁹ The only way, then, of securing the necessary blood was to derive it from the hands and the feet. From these it is made to flow, sometimes, naturally, in drops (these often in groups of three³⁰), but sometimes so copiously as to be caught in chalices by angelic or cherubic figures. Blood is especially abundant in the seventeenth century and particularly in German pictures.

From all this it will be clear that from the theological point of view any depiction of the crucifixion, no matter how great the agony portrayed, is quite ineffective if the victim be bound with ropes. In the case of the thieves there is no objection to ropes. No one is saved by their blood. Let us then see what evidence,

²⁷ A Byzantine painting in the Opera del Duomo, Florence.

²⁸ On a Grünewald altarpiece at Bath.

²⁹ It does not appear in the eleventh-century Psalter of Saint Michael in the Mediæan Library.

³⁰ Jarves Collection, Yale, Lorenzo di Nicolo (fourteenth century).

outside of these theologically inspired pictures, can be found for the use of nails in crucifixion.

One has to be very well acquainted with his Bible to escape the error of supposing that the gospel accounts furnish us with the evidence for which we are searching. In point of fact, in no gospel account of the death of Christ is there so much as one mention of a nail. In the Fourth Gospel, however, we do have the story of doubting Thomas, who would not believe that Jesus had appeared to the disciples in his absence. He must have ocular proof; he must put his fingers into the very print of the nails. Jesus appeared to him and offered him the proof that he desired. Art regularly represents him fingering the wounds. The narrative itself implies the contrary. The very sight of Jesus solved all his doubts and brought from him a very advanced conception of the person of Christ. But in either case there is distinct implication that the writer of the Fourth Gospel believed that nails had been used in the crucifixion of Jesus. The silence of the Synoptists is no argument to the contrary, for if nailing were the regular procedure there would be no particular point in mentioning it.

But of course the bulk of the evidence for the method of inflicting crucifixion comes to us from sources outside the Bible. The handbooks give citations from classical and post-classical writers to prove the use of nails. After all, crucifixion, though not originally a Roman punishment, had been thoroughly adopted by the Romans, and the crucifixion of Jesus was a Roman execution. But if it has been noticed, the fact has certainly not been emphasized that the story of Thomas mentions nailprints only in the hands, not in the feet. The argument from silence is not here specially effective. But when we have observed the fact of that silence we become aware that we are left without a shred of evidence from Holy Writ for the nailing of the feet.

And, after all, the historical development of this type of execution is not without significance. The punishment seems to have originated in Egypt. The Egyptians did not nail their victims, they tied them. W. Adams Brown in Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible (I, 529) says that in Roman crucifixions the

victim was bound to the crosspiece, that then the hands were nailed to the extremities of the piece and possibly the feet to the upright, though this was less frequent. For evidence we are always referred to certain Latin and Greek authors whose testimonies have not, however, always been very closely inspected. For instance, the Catholic Encyclopedia (IV, 519, n. 1) reports Plautus as telling us that the culprit was fastened with four nails to the wood of the cross. One wonders why in face of this alleged testimony the church reduced the four nails to three. But in fact it is very doubtful if any such inference can be drawn from the words of Plautus, who in the *Mostellaria* (line 360) represents a slave offering a reward to anyone who will take his place on the cross, on the condition, however,

ut offigantur bis pedes, bis bracchia.

This passage does not prove the use of four nails; it can equally well be taken to demonstrate that eight nails were used. The slave demands that each hand and each foot be nailed, or else that each hand and each foot be double nailed. Even if we could determine which, we could scarcely determine the actual usage. The humor of the passage lies in the comic caution of the slave who demands something absolutely unheard of. If, as the writer in the Catholic Encyclopedia thinks, he calls for four nails, we might argue that the usual number was only two. But if he calls for eight we are not driven to assume that four was the usual number. His thought might at least equally well be 'on condition that feet as well as hands be pegged, and with two nails each.' At any rate the passage is shaky ground on which to build so confidently. It would be unwise to blink the fact that on occasion unusual methods of attaching the victim were employed. In the Martyrology, under November 4, we read that Agricola was pegged with a lot of nails (*plurimi*), and under November 9 that Philomenus was pierced with nails through hands and feet and head.

We have a curious passage from Livy (i. 16, 6) purporting to give the steps by which a sororicide was to be punished for his deed. His head was to be veiled and he was to be hung on an unlucky tree by a rope. This suggests death by hanging in the

modern way, and in fact two sections further on the word for noose is employed. The ancients were acquainted with the process of strangulation by hanging, for it is described in the *Odyssey*, but I doubt if death by suffocation is indicated here. For Livy goes on to say that then the victim is to be beaten. Both Weissenborn and Müller in their annotated editions explain the mention of the scourging in this place in the narrative as due to the fact that it was a subordinate and purely incidental part of the punishment. They allege that the punishment was strangulation and was preceded by the scourging. I cannot be so sure. If this were a crucifixion, we should have early and good testimony for the practice of attaching the victim by a rope, and such *hysteron proteron* is not uncommon in the ancient writers.

Of the scanty references for the use of nails three are derived from the early empire, when crucifixion was still a common form of punishment for slaves. Philo Judaeus (I, 237) compares souls dependent on lifeless things to men crucified and nailed to a tree. Seneca (*De vita beata* 19) speaks of each man's driving his own nails into his cross, and Lucan (vi. 547) describes a collector of material for magic practices as she gathers various uncanny objects, among them iron that had been driven into hands (*insertum manibus chalybem*). It is Erichtho, the Thessalian witch, who is foraging in cemetery and place of execution. The magic of the iron, and more precisely of the nail, is enhanced if it has been used in a crucifixion. This passage conspires with the silence of the gospels to make it unlikely that nails were driven into the feet in Roman crucifixions. Erichtho culls the nails from the hands. Why does she not use the nails from the feet? They would be much more easily accessible. This is no valid argument if any reason can be alleged why nails from the hands were more potent magically than nails from the feet; but I can find no indication that such was the case. Nails from the hands would be out of convenient reach, and their removal would cause the body to drop and would betray the theft and the thief. Incidentally, it is rather curious, if not significant, that the older Pliny (*H. N.* xxviii. 4) mentions among magical paraphernalia *spartum e cruce*, that is, a rope

that has been used in a crucifixion. Possibly we are to understand that ropes were used for both hands and feet, but if the use of the rope is to be thought of as confined to either, it would be used for the feet only.

For further testimony to the use of the nails in crucifixions we are directed to the church fathers. Some of the passages date from the time before crucifixion had been abandoned as a punishment, and while not conclusive for the usage of the reign of Tiberius, their significance cannot be ignored. Daremberg and Saglio cite them to corroborate the statement that the crucified were nailed hand and foot. I doubt if they can be taken to prove the point at issue.

Tertullian, who died about 130 A.D., speaks (*Adversus Ju-daeos*, 667 A-B) of the killing of Christ "*nervos suffigendo clavis.*" The nails are mentioned, but their number is not indicated and nothing is said about nailing the feet. In the early fourth century Lactantius (Migne, VI, 484 A) quotes a response in Greek given by the Milesian Apollo upon being asked whether Jesus was god or man. The oracle declared that Jesus endured a bitter death *σπλαγχνόφοις καὶ σκολοπέσσοι* ('with nails and pointed stakes'). Here again, we are not told that nails were used for the feet, but neither do we find explicit mention of ropes for that purpose. The word *σπλάγχνα*, while of broad significance, is used of ropes in Herodotus vii. 25 and ix. 115. From a passage of Eusebius (H. E. viii. 8) we are informed that men were sometimes nailed to the cross head down. In such cases nails may have been used to confine the feet as well as the hands. Finally, in a sermon of Cyprian, who died in 258, we find the words "*clavis sacros pedes terebrantibus,*" where at last we have the unequivocal statement for which we have so far looked in vain.

It is difficult to see what could be gained by nailing the feet except the infliction of a modicum of immediate pain. This is quite out of keeping with the whole idea of crucifixion, the object of which seems to have been to expose the victim to a slow and very painful death by hunger, thirst, and exposure. Nailing the feet would defeat this object to a degree only less than the breaking of the legs, which we know to have been practised

when it was desired to shorten the agony or hasten the death. In a description of the crucifixion of Saint Andrew (*Hist. Apost.* iii) it is stated that the proconsul ordered Andrew to be bound hands and feet with ropes, and that no nails at all be employed, so as to give him a longer period of suffering before he died. Lipsius remarks on this passage that crucifixion with ropes was the more cruel of the two methods of crucifixion which he recognizes (*De cruce* 2, 7, XLI f.). It seems to me that the horror of the punishment, like that of the raw-hide practised by the renegade Apache Geronimo, or of the dropping of water on a victim's head, was precisely that it began so mildly. It might be hours before discomfort became agony, but from the moment when the victim was placed in position he foresaw the agony, and the knowledge would itself be the keenest torture.

So far as I can see, there was one main reason why the church and the art of the church chose so persistently to emphasize the nails. Only thus could there be complete and literal fulfilment of what the church held to be messianic prophecy — the passage in which the Psalmist says (21, 17), "They pierced my hands and my feet." Prominent among the passages quoted by Lipsius to prove the use of nails for both hands and feet stands this prophecy. It probably lies at the root of Cyprian's words as well. Lipsius refers also to a passage of Nonnus (chap. 19), who speaks of Jesus as carrying iron nails (*κέντρα*) in feet and hands. Nonnus wrote in the early fifth century, and the passage is derived from his paraphrase of the gospel of John in Greek hexameters. But as this detail is demonstrably not in his source or original, it may fairly be presumed that the prophecy of the Psalmist is influential here also.

When once the type of the crucifixion with nails in the feet has become fixed in art, testimony about nails is of no value unless it can be shown to rest upon earlier data. So the words of Gregory of Tours (*De gloria* 106) that the Lord was crucified with two nails in the hands and two in the feet can scarcely rest upon anything but the art of the time, which was in turn inspired by this supposed prophecy.

There is another possible influence that may have contributed to strengthen the tradition of nails. In the Middle Ages Pro-

metheus bound to his rock and tortured for his services to man was considered a prototype of Christ. The famous play of Aeschylus represented the Titan fastened by nails. The text, to be sure, makes it clear that the nails are not driven through hands or feet but are used to fasten to the rock the fetters that confine the sufferer's hands and feet. The only piercing of the flesh by the metal is by a wedge driven right through the victim's chest. But possibly this was not absolutely without influence upon the artists' type of the crucifixion.

To sum up, there is astonishingly little evidence that the feet of a crucified person were ever pierced by nails. The strength of the tradition to that effect is due chiefly to the attempt to fulfil in detail a supposed messianic prophecy, assisted by the need of blood which theology felt in order that the sacrificial aspect of the Saviour's death might not be obscured or eliminated entirely.

THE ARMENIAN LIFE OF MARUTHA OF MAIPHERKAT

RALPH MARCUS

JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION, AND COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE Armenian Vita here translated, of Marutha, a Syrian bishop of the fifth century, has an interest because of Marutha's activity as mediator between the Byzantine emperors, Arcadius and Theodosius II, and the Sassanian king Yezdegerd I.

The ancient sources for the life of Marutha are scanty¹ nor does the biography here translated add greatly to our knowledge of him. From the Greek and Nestorian sources it is known that he was present at the important councils of the church in the last decades of the fourth century; was sent to the court of Persia, probably at least twice, once on the accession of Yezdegerd in 399 A.D. and again about 408 A.D., when Theodosius II became emperor of the eastern Romans; and that he was present at the Council of Seleucia in 410 A.D.² He is reputed to be the author of numerous works on church history and theology, some of which are extant,³ the most important being a history

¹ For the literature on Marutha see Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Rome, 1719-1728, I, 174, 195; III, 74; Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse*, Paris, 1904, pp. 87-90; E. Nestle in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, XII, Leipzig, 1902, p. 392; Duval, *La Littérature syriaque*, 3d ed., Paris, 1907, pp. 132 ff.; Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922, pp. 53-54.

² Labourt, p. 88 note 5, and p. 89.

³ Assemani, III, 74, gives 'Abhdišo's catalogue of works written by Marutha, among them a "book concerning martyrs," which Assemani identifies with the Persian martyrology mentioned in the next note. For other works by Marutha see Baumstark. A list of Armenian translations of Marutha's writings is given in the *Catalogue des anciennes traductions arméniennes*, Venice, 1889; they include "Orations and Disquisitions: On the Mystery of the Church; On the Mystery of the Third Day of the Week; On the Martyrdom of St. Simeon and other Martyrs; On the Holiness of Christ." For a discussion and translation of Syriac fragments of Marutha's writings, see also O. Braun, *De Sancta Nicaena Synodo* (*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, IV), Münster, 1898, and A. von Harnack, *Der Ketzer-Katalog des Bischofs Maruta von Maipherkat* (*Texte u. Untersuchungen*, N. F. IV). These two studies, cited by Chabot, *Synodon Orientale*, p. 4, n. 1, I have not consulted.

of the Christian martyrs who died in Persia in the reigns of Sapur II and Yezdegerd I. There is no good reason to doubt Marutha's authorship of this history, which claims to have been based on accounts given by contemporaries.⁴

We have brief accounts of the bishop of Maipherkat (or of Mesopotamia, as he is called in the Greek sources) in the church histories of Socrates⁵ and Sozomen,⁶ both of whom composed their works within a generation after the death of Marutha (c. 420 A.D.), in the church history of Theophanes⁷ (ninth century), and on the Oriental side in the history of the Nestorian patriarchs⁸ written in Arabic by Mārī ibn Sulaimān (twelfth century) and revised by 'Amr ibn Mattā (fifteenth century), and in the ecclesiastical chronicle of Bar Hebraeus,⁹ (thirteenth century).

In order to afford a basis for comparison of our Armenian version with the other accounts of Marutha's life, and to offer materials for a more complete biography than yet exists, I have thought it best to prefix to the translation of the Armenian Vita translations of the Greek and Semitic sources mentioned above.¹⁰

First in time is the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, who (vi. 15; I, 704) mentions Marutha at the council of Chalcedon in connection with Cyrinus, who came to the council to attack John Chrysostom:

He spoke [against John] before the bishops, calling him impious, a charlatan, and a stubborn mule (*ἀγόνατον*), at which the bishops were delighted. But Marutha, bishop of Mesopotamia, accidentally stepped on one of Cyrinus' feet, and the latter was incapacitated and unable to accompany the other bishops to Constantinople.

⁴ The Syriac text was first published by Assemani, *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium*, 2 vols., Rome, 1748; this was translated into German by Zingerle, *Echte Akten heiliger Märtyrer des Morgenlandes*, Innsbruck, 1831; a fuller text was published by Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, Paris, 1890, II, 57–396.

⁵ Edited by R. Hussey, Oxford, 1853.

⁶ Edited by R. Hussey, Oxford, 1860.

⁷ Edited by Classen in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Bonn, 1839.

⁸ Maris, Amri et Slibae de Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria, ed. Gismondi, Rome, vol. I, 1899, vol. II, 1897.

⁹ Bar Hebraei *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. Abbeloos et Lamy, Louvain, 1872–77.

¹⁰ I have not been able to consult Photius, *Bibliotheca*; on the *Synodicon Orientale*, ed. Chabot, Paris, 1902, see the Postscript at the close of this article.

Cyrinus, we regret to learn, soon after died from an infection caused by Marutha's carelessness.

The second and more important passage in Socrates (vii. 8; I, 743–746) tells of Marutha's adventures at the court of Yezdegerd I, who reigned from 399 to 420 A.D.

About the same time ¹¹ Christianity was spread in Persia in the following way. Between the Romans and Persians there had been frequent interchanges of embassies, and the causes for these mutual embassies were various. At this particular time necessity brought it about that Marutha, the bishop of Mesopotamia, whom we mentioned a little while ago, was sent by the Roman emperor to the Persian king. And the king of Persia, finding him to be a man of great piety, showed him great honor and hearkened to him as to a truly God-inspired man (*θεοφιλεῖ*). These actions displeased the Magians (for they have great influence with the king of Persia), as they feared that he [Marutha] might convert the king to Christianity, for Marutha by his prayers had healed the chronic headache of the king, which the Magians had not been able to heal. The Magians accordingly contrived a treacherous plan. As the Persians worship fire, and as the king was accustomed to adore the continually burning fire in a temple, they hid a certain fellow under the ground, and instructed him to cry out, at such a time as the king came to pray, that the king must be cast out because he had been impious in believing the Christian priest to be inspired by God. When Isdegerd — this was the king's name — heard this, although he held Marutha in reverence, nevertheless he decided to send him away. But Marutha, being a truly God-inspired man, gave himself up to prayer, and by this means discovered the trick of the Magians; and he said to the king, "Do not be deceived, O king. If thou go back to the place whence thou heardst the voice, and dig there, thou wilt discover the trick, for it was not the fire that cried out, but the machinations of men that effected this." The Persian king believed Marutha and again entered the temple where the perpetual fire burned; and when he again heard the same voice, he commanded the earth in that place to be dug up; whereupon he who had uttered the supposedly divine voice was discovered. The king then became very wrathful, and decimated the order of Magians. After this he told Marutha that he might build churches wherever he liked. In this way Christianity was spread among the Persians. Then Marutha left Persia and returned to Constantinople. But, not long after, he was again sent there on an embassy. Once more the Magians plotted treachery in order that the king might not receive him at all. They created an artificial stench in the place whence the king was wont to proceed, and charged that the Christian believers had made it. But inasmuch as the king, having the Magians under suspicion, rigorously sought out the perpetrators of the deed, it was again found that those who had made the foul odor were Magians. A second time, therefore, he punished many of them, but Marutha he held in still greater honor. And he cherished the Romans and formed a friendship with them. And he very nearly became a

¹¹ At the death of Theophilos and the accession of Cyril as bishop of Alexandria (412 A.D.).

Christian on the occasion of Marutha's performing another miracle, together with Abla,¹² the bishop of Persia. For together they drove out the demon that was troubling the king's son, by practising fasts and vigils. Now Isdegerd died before he could become a Christian completely, and the kingdom passed to his son Bararanes,¹³ under whom the treaty between Rome and Persia was dissolved, as we shall relate a little further on.

The reference in Sozomen (viii. 16; I, 835) need not be cited, as it describes the incident of Marutha crushing Cyrinus' foot already given in the first excerpt from Socrates, and is very likely drawn from Socrates.

By Theophanes, in two passages, one or two new details are added. In the first (i. 128), a notice of the year 5906 A.M. (406 A.D.), he tells us:

In this year ¹⁴ Hypatia the philosopher, daughter of the philosopher Theon, was violently put to death. In the same year Isdegerd, the king of Persia, having been previously influenced by the exhortations of Marutha, bishop of Mesopotamia, and Abda, bishop of the capital city of Persia, reached such a height of piety that he was almost baptized, through the miracles of Marutha. And he punished the Magians as deceivers. In the twentieth year [of his reign] he died.

In the second notice (i. 132), of the year 5916 A.M. (416 A.D.), Theophanes writes:

In the same year Theodosius ¹⁵ sent a royal crown to Valentinian in Rome by the hand of Helion Patricius, and Marutha, bishop of Mesopotamia, healed the son of Isdegerd, king of Persia, who was possessed by a demon, by praying and fasting; wherefore Isdegerd conceived a great attachment ($\pi\lambda\eta\rho\phi\rho\iota\alpha\nu$) to Christianity.

Coming now to the Oriental sources, we may first cite the Nestorian history of Mārī ibn Sulaimān, called *Kitāb almijdal* (Liber turris), folio 151b–153a:¹⁶

After [Qayyūmā had been patriarch] five years, peace was made between the Roman emperor and the Persian king Yezdegerd. The latter requested the emperor to send him a man skilled in medicine (*mutatabbib*), and he sent him the bishop of Mayyafāraqin,¹⁷ Mār Marūthā by name, an accomplished physician and a man of perfect piety (*jamil almadhab*). When he asked the

¹² Read Abda (Syriac 'Abhda.) ¹³ Bahram V.

¹⁴ This sentence may belong with the following notice, as Hypatia was killed in 415 A.D.

¹⁵ Theodosius II, 408–450 A.D.

¹⁶ Arabic text, pp. 29 ff.; Gismondi's Latin version, pp. 25 ff.

¹⁷ Maipherkat; see below on Martyropolis in Armenian Vita.

king for permission to erect churches, and for the Christians to live according to their own ways (*rusūm*) and openly to profess their religion, the king granted this. And the church in Babylon, near the pit of Daniel, was restored, which the Jews had formerly destroyed after killing the monks, elders, and deacons who were in it; and there he established a community (*jamā'a*) of monks. And Mār Marūthā, the bishop, healed the son of Yezdegerd of an epilepsy (*sar'*) from which he had suffered. And when matters were settled, he [Qayyūmā] resigned from the patriarchate and bestowed it upon Isaac. But the Magians were angry that the king showed favor to the Christians, because Marutha had also cured the king of a violent headache (*sada' sadid*) which had attacked him. And they anointed a certain man with an unguent that protected against the heat of fire, and placed him in the fire. And when the king passed by, the fire addressed him with reproaches and abuse for having honored the Christians and having permitted the building of churches. And he was troubled and distressed, and he summoned Marūthā, and the latter said to him, "This is a trick, and I will reveal it, if thou wilt allow me to enter the fire and fetch out the speaker." And he [the king] said, "Enter"; and Marūthā entered and fetched out the speaker. And never again after this did the fire speak. And the king commanded that the attendants of the fire-temple be killed; and his friendship for the Christians increased.

Isaac, a kinsman of Tomarsa,¹⁸ was a chaste, kind, and prudent man and a performer of miracles. And when Qayyūmā saw that God desired the gathering together¹⁹ of the Christians, and the establishing of their affairs, he wrote to all the metropolitans and bishops of the Eastern cities, and they came to him in the church of Madāyn,²⁰ and were assembled in his presence together with Marūthā the physician, bishop of Mayyafāraqīn. He said to them, "Ye know that I am not fitted for this office (*ra'āsa*) because of my infirmity and my sins, and behold I have given myself to God, who is mighty and glorious, because I have not found any who would offer himself to God, who is blessed and exalted, and because I feared that Christianity might disappear in the East, and that its churches and patriarchate (*ra'āsa*) might disappear. And now God has averted what we feared, through these two blessed kings and this blessed bishop, and the fear has ceased. And I ask you to release me from the patriarchate and bestow it upon another, whom God, whose name is exalted, shall choose for you and through you." And they wept and said, "How dost thou think that this is lawful, since thou hast already given thyself to God, whose name is exalted, and hast suffered greatly, and it is meet that we should be thy servants?" But he continued to supplicate them until they associated with him in the patriarchate the above mentioned Isaac, in Madāyn, according to rule. And they laid the condition upon him that he should act as a son toward Qayyūmā, the blessed and venerable man (*śayḥ*), and should not decide anything except with his approval; and Isaac did this, and more than fulfilled the conditions laid upon him, until the death of Qayyūmā. And when he died he was buried in Madāyn. And Marūthā, the bishop and physician, continued to teach the people of the East all the

¹⁸ So the Arabic text. Gismondi in his Latin version has 'Marutae cognatus,' probably a slip of the pen.

¹⁹ Gismondi, wrongly I think, translates *ijtima'* as 'restauratio.'

²⁰ Ctesiphon.

traditions (*sunna*) and decisions of the people of the West, on which they had agreed in their synods, and had confirmed there. And they received these from him and confirmed among themselves, and they made known to him that the Westerners were their brethren and comrades. And Marūthā gathered a great number of the bones of the martyrs who had been martyred in the East, and copies of every book he found of them, and he carried these with him, and left part in his seat at Mayyafāraqīn — and this is remembered there to this day, where people are blessed by them — and with the remainder he travelled to the West, and they were distributed among the churches.

And Mār Marūthā met with the one hundred and fifty bishops who were gathered in Constantinople, and he described to them the purity of faith of the Eastern people and their piety and their long-suffering in martyrdom. And he said that his journey was the cause of good because he had seen those people, their modesty, the sincerity of their intentions; and that they were, in his opinion, in the class of angels (*rūhanīn*), and that there was not in their cities or churches any division of opinion or any sects or deviation from what the Gospel taught and the preaching of the apostle Paul and what the apostle Luke reported in the Acts of the Apostles. Then he asked permission of the emperor to return to the East and to be blessed there, and the emperor granted permission, and he returned; and with him there was a bishop of Amida-on-the-hill, whose name was Acacius.²¹ And it happened in the days of this bishop that some patricians of Rūm²² had taken captive some of the people of Ba'arbāyā and the region of Mesopotamia to the number of four thousand men, among them bishops of this region. And this bishop said, "This does not become us, and our prayers will not be heard, for these our brethren have been taken captive from their province, and we see them in this condition and do not release them." And he sold all the ornaments of the rest of the churches in his province, gold and silver, and received for them sixteen thousand drachmas; and he bought them [the captives] back and restored them to their homes.²³ And the patriarch Isaac died and was buried in Madāyn, after eleven years in office.

The next authority in chronological order is Bar Hebraeus (iii. 46 ff.), whose Syriac Ecclesiastical Chronicle was written in the second half of the thirteenth century:

Five years after his [Qayyūmā's] ordination²⁴ peace was made between Arcadius the Greek emperor, and Izdegerd king of Persia, who was a persecutor of the Christians. To him was sent on an embassy ('izgadūthā) Marūthā, bishop of Mayperqaṭ, a learned man and wonderful teacher; and through his coming the Christians were granted peace. Then Qayyūmā gathered all the Eastern bishops in the presence (*m'ayyebhūthā*) of Marūthā, and urged them to release him because he was feeble (*m'hil*) When the bishops refused to let him resign, he laid upon them the word of God to do it, and urged Marūthā also to persuade them. Then they unwillingly agreed, and ordained

²¹ Arabic *'aqāq*.

²² Byzantium.

²³ Compare the story of the ransom of Nep'rkert in the Armenian.

²⁴ 394 A.D.

Isaac in his place. . . . In the six hundred and sixty-first year of the Greeks,²⁵ in the reign of Theodosius the Great, a synod of one hundred and fifty bishops was convened at Constantinople, in which Macedonius of Constantinople was deposed (*b'qel*), who had blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, asserting that He was a created being (*b'rithā*). And Marūthā of Mayperqaṭ was again sent a second time as an ambassador to Izdegerd in his eleventh year,²⁶ on which occasion he informed the catholicus Isaac of [the decisions of] the council. And so Isaac summoned forty of his bishops, who, as faithful believers, agreed to the deposition of Macedonius. And Marūthā prescribed for them admirable canons, and taught the Easterners a good order (*sappirīth m'taksūthā*) [of services?]. And Isaac died, having served eleven years, and was buried in Seleucia.

The last source is the Nestorian history of 'Amr ibn Mattā (pp. 23–25; Latin version pp. 13–15):

Isaac. This Father was a venerable, good, wise, upright, merciful man, given to fasting and prayer, and performing signs and miracles, and furthering the welfare of his flock by the best means. And it happened that Yezdegerd, king of Persia, was afflicted by an illness that the Persian physicians could not heal — and many Christian physicians had been killed in the reign of Sapor, and those who survived had fled to other lands — and he wrote to the Roman emperor, asking him for a skilled physician. And he sent Marūthā, bishop of Mayyafāraqīn, a learned and upright man and a skilful physician (*tabīb hadhīq*), known for his fear of God and his good works. Now Arcadius the Roman emperor had heard what evils the Christians had suffered in the country of the Persians, namely torture and banishment and death; and this saddened and troubled him, and he had no way of helping them. And he found this a favorable occasion to write a letter to Yezdegerd, in which he said: "God, who is mighty and glorious, has given us royal authority, not that we should seek our own advantage, but has given us power that we may use righteously, to punish the guilty and to reward the good man according to his merit. And as though thou wert one of his worshippers, he has made thee a great gift from among the kingdoms of the world, and into thy hand has placed his creatures. But contrary to law and justice are the violences, robberies, and killings inflicted upon the Christians in thy realm. And if these things are done without thy knowledge, still thy ministers (*ashābuka*) do them in their lust for the wealth of the Christians, which they take for themselves; and this will bring upon thee both the wrath of God and the indignation of men, who, when they see the wrong done to their fellows, will be greatly angered and find it beyond endurance. And if these people [the Persian ministers] turned their energies to fighting the enemy and governing the kingdom, I should find it better. Now we request thee hereafter to treat the Christians well and to end the injustice and the injury [done] to them, and to permit the building of churches." And he sent this letter with the bishop Marūthā; and when he came to Yezdegerd and treated him and healed him of his illness, he gave over

²⁵ 350 A.D. The editors of Bar Hebraeus note that the synod of 150 bishops was held in 381 A.D., and that Macedonius was deposed at the previous synod of 360 A.D.

²⁶ 410 A.D.

to him the letter. And he [the king] opened it, and rejoiced at it, and granted what had been requested of him. And peace (*sukūn*) surrounded the Christians, and what they had [suffered] ceased. Now the patriarch Isaac desired to establish canons useful for precepts (*farā'īd*) and counsels of religion (*aḥkām addinīyya*), and he summoned to him the Fathers who were in the provinces and convened from their number forty bishops and metropolitans in the eleventh year of the reign of Yezdegerd, and they assembled on the birthday [of the Lord] (*yawn 'id almilād*), and Marūthā was present with them. And Isaac with the approval of all established twenty-two canons, which were necessary for the government of the church in the East, and these found favor in the eyes of Marūthā and he approved them. Then he made known to them the canons which the Western Fathers had written in synod, and at the same time there were brought to him the letters written at the council of Nicaea, at the time when they were present there with those at the council. And Marūthā had copies made of all the canons and commentaries (*tafāsir*) which he found among [the works of] the Eastern Fathers and which are not found among the Greeks. And he gathered together a great number of the bones of the martyrs and took [them] with him; and when the council of the one hundred and fifty bishops met in Constantinople, this bishop Marūthā met with them. He published among them, and informed them of, all that he had witnessed and seen of the righteousness of the Easterners and the purity of their belief and their love and their sincerity of thought and the chastity of their monks and their fortitude under abuse and trials, the good order (*tartib*) of their churches and their constancy in one opinion and their wholeness from impurity in respect of erroneous doctrines, and their zeal and devotion applied to the interpretation (*ma'ānā*) of the holy Scriptures, and especially the holy Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of Paul and his commentary (*tafsīr*) and explanations (*śurūh*). And he said, "I found the Christians of the East like corporeal angels (*malā'ik jismāniyyin*), because they have advanced so far in knowledge and love and humility and chastity." And Isaac died in the twelfth year of Yezdegerd, that is, the seven hundred and twenty-eighth year of the Greeks,²⁷ and was buried in Madāyn, and his rule had lasted eleven years.

Finally we come to the Armenian Vita, which, as we learn from the text itself, was translated from the Syriac by a certain Gagig, presumably a priest,²⁸ and his deacon Grigor. There is no indication of the date of the translation other than the fact that it mentions the Sassanian king Kawādh (I),²⁹ who died in 531 A.D. As he is mistakenly made the grandson of Yezdegerd I, instead of Yezdegerd II, we may assume that Gagig wrote some time after the close of the sixth century, late enough for the chronology to be left uncertain.³⁰ The name Gagig is common,³¹

²⁷ 416 A.D. In fact, the twelfth year of Yezdegerd was 411 A.D.

²⁸ In two mss. he is called *hayr* 'Father.'

²⁹ Kawat in Armenian.

³⁰ Unless indeed the story of Kawat is an addition to Gagig's text.

³¹ See F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 107–108.

but there is a possibility that our translator is the same who rendered from Syriac into Armenian a life of the Egyptian monk Narses.³²

The text of the Armenian version is found in *Vark‘ ew Vkayabouout‘iunk‘ Srboç* (Vitae et passiones sanctorum), Venice, 1874, II, 17–32. I am greatly indebted to Professor Louis H. Gray of Columbia University for his kindness in putting at my disposal a French translation he had made of pp. 17–22 of the text, and for his helpful suggestions and corrections.

The History of the Life of the Blessed Marut‘a

[17] Brethren and fathers, listen to the story of the blessed Marut‘a, through whom the Lord manifested miracles to the world, because he was called to the grace of adoption and became a shepherd of Christ’s flock, which was cast by demons into pastures of death and into abysses of perdition; and through him it pleased God to bring back the lost ones of our land. And I shall recount according to my ability, although my mind is too feeble and my words are too simple to tell the miracles of the man of God, who was visibly manifested by the power of Christ and needeth not fine words. Listen, then, confirmed by the love and the faith of the true Shepherd who hath called you to kingship in Christ; and ye thirst with thirst³³ for spiritual admonition and for divine miracles; ye have drunk delicious draughts which were vouchsafed unto you by Christ through the blessed one of whom we shall relate a little [chosen] from many [things].

This land was ensnared in the idolatry of the demons of seduction, and men worshipped with sacrifices the creatures and not the Creator who is eternally praised. As if taken in battle at night, and enmeshed in various evils, is that which, darkened by its many sins,³⁴ the light of the knowledge of God doth not illumine. [18] But when God wished to save this land and to

³² Cf. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis*, Brussels, 1910, p. 176.

³³ Semitic idiom, found also in the Greek Old and New Testaments. For the Syriac original, see T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*, 2d ed., Leipzig, 1898, pp. 225–226.

³⁴ Read *xawareal ‘i pēspēs melsn* in place of *‘i xawareal pēspēs mels*.

bring [it] back from its straying to the knowledge of God, in the time of the blessed Yakob bishop of Mcbin,³⁵ the wonderful man of God, a certain woman named Mariam, a daughter of the nobles of Armenia, was given as wife to the heathen pontiff of the Otayecs,³⁶ who was lord of that land; and by the hand of that woman Mariam Christianity was revealed in that land; and she built a church and consecrated a monastery and established priests and ministers who offered daily praise to God, and she herself granted necessities in full to the ministers, and made herself obedient to the Christian religion before God and man, and she converted her husband to Christianity so that he gave up the service of a vain worship and worshipped the God of heaven and earth; and by her good counsel and the daily prayers which she offered for her husband, he, following the wishes of Mariam, believed in the true God and was baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and his name was called Marut'a,³⁷ which is translated "lord of the land," because he was in truth the lord of that land; and there was much rejoicing over the man and the woman who had been [added] to the glory of our God. But a little while after came the end of Marut'a, the husband of Mariam, and he left three sons born of Mariam [and] believing in God Almighty; one of them was lord of the land; and two [were] generals of the kings, renowned and glorious in the eyes of all. And Mariam, justified by faith and hope, buried her husband as was meet for Christians, and giving thanks she praised God that she had seen her husband pass away believing in God. And after that she determined to go to Jerusalem and to provide for the holy churches and to divide her possessions with the poor and the ministers of the churches for the redemption [19] of the life of her sons, for the lady had so great a soul and faith and fear of God; and she entreated God continually that he make her sons worthy to

³⁵ Nisibis. Cf. H. Hübschmann, Altarmenische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1897, I, 295. On Yakob, see E. Nestle, Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., Leipzig, 1900, VIII, 559.

³⁶ One ms. *Awtac*. It is probably the province Utı. Cf. H. Hübschmann, Altarmenische Ortsnamen, Strasbourg, 1904, pp. 270–275.

³⁷ Syriac, Marūthā, 'lordship,' explained by a popular Armenian etymology as *mar utha*, 'lord of Utha.'

become priests of God, in order that she might, by the priesthood of Christ, heal the scar of sins, [that is] the former worship of idols by her husband, and that the most holy Trinity might always be glorified ³⁸ by her race.

And she returned to Antioch of Asorestan ³⁹ and dwelt in the martyr chapel of Saint Eliazar and of Šmawon Samune ⁴⁰ and of her seven sons who were martyred; ⁴¹ and she passed the whole night in prayer to God. With many entreaties and tears she asked the Lord of all, by the intercession of the saints, to fulfil the prayer which she had desired, as has been said before. And in a vision she saw an angel of God who said to her, "Courage, O woman, for thy prayer hath been heard by God, and that which thou shalt ask of God will be thine by the intercession of the saints in whom thou hast believed." And with a commingling of fear and joy she glorified God and offered praise, and she believed the words of the angel. And when she had returned to her home, she had a grandson by her son who was 'lord of the land'; and her heart was joyful, and she rendered thanks to Almighty God, and she had him baptized by the priest Marmara who loved God, and she named him with the name of his grandfather Marut'a, and she resolved that through this man God should make a visitation of this land, because there had been a manifestation of grace over the child. And after five ⁴² years she gave him for instruction to the priest Marmara who loved God, and he taught him to read and instructed him in the ways of the wisdom of life [20] and in the faith of righteousness. And when he reached the age of the perfection of Christ, ⁴³ and appeared to be endowed with all graces and pleasing to God and man, he appointed him deacon, and after that a priest of the church of God, which had been built by his grandmother Mariam; and he knew and understood that this life is vain, and

³⁸ Read *p'araworci* in place of *parawori*?

³⁹ Here means Syria. For other meanings of Asorestan see below, note 51.

⁴⁰ One ms., Šmawoni.

⁴¹ Cf. 2 Maccabees 6, 14-7, 41; 4 Maccabees, chaps. 8 ff. In the Greek the mother's name is not given, but in the Syriac memre celebrating the Maccabean martyrs her name is given as Šamone, cf. Bensly, Fourth Book of Maccabees and Kindred Documents in Syriac, Cambridge, 1895.

⁴² One ms. 'seven.'

⁴³ That is, thirty-three years.

he chose the way of holiness and righteousness, and he despised the life of this world; and he went on in going⁴⁴ and made progress in the laborious labors of piety by testimonies to Christ. Because of this Mariam was filled with joy, because she saw the grandson of her hopes endowed with all austerity, and she rejoiced and praised God, and went away to her convent that she had built before, and there she became a devotee of great austerity; she accomplished all the days of her life to the glory of God. And afterwards came the end of Mariam, fulfilled in days and transported to Christ by all her virtue; and Marut'a adorned her tomb magnificently, and Marut'a himself made still more progress in the path of uprightness; by prayers and by vigils he disciplined himself with all purification, not moved by thought, word, or deed, and he never wished to receive anything from the land, and, being renowned and celebrated everywhere because of his struggles for uprightness, he was called to the grace of the episcopate, in view of the plenitude of the grace which was revealed in him; for he was illumined by grace and divine wisdom and he advanced constantly, signalizing himself by his attachment to virtue; and he went in the ways of Christ with an apostolic mission, bringing back the lost to the wisdom of the truth; and he built churches and distributed priests and ministers who glorified the most holy Trinity; and the monasteries which had been built by his grandmother [21] he augmented with anchorites; and he fortified the upright in the faith in the institutions of the divine religion in the manner of the first holy fathers; and he reformed the inhabitants of the land anew, both men and women, according to the image of God by his holy ways and his brilliant teaching and his very great miracles, and he cleansed them of foolish heresy and polytheistic error, and he led all toward righteousness; and he revealed himself like a bright lamp to them that sat in darkness and the shadow of death;⁴⁵ he drove out the darkness of ignorance from this land; he expelled the bands of the left hand⁴⁶ by the virtue of Christ, and he believed that the ranks of the angels of the right were the protection of the believers in Christ; he purified

⁴⁴ Semitism; cf. Nöldeke, above, note 33.

⁴⁵ Luke 1, 79.

⁴⁶ One ms. 'the bands of the demons (*devi*)'.

his heart of evil thought; he received divine grace; showing it by love and by aspiration, he loved virtue in his life, and his tongue spoke of righteousness, and he preached holiness constantly to all the land, freely receiving and freely giving the gifts of the Creator.⁴⁷ And all men, when they heard the words of God from the holy bishop, turned from the worship of idols to the true God, for by the prayers of the saint he led the wandering souls of mankind back to righteousness; and they overthrew the images of the gods and built monasteries and churches, and the cults of the worship of the pagan priests were forbidden, and they took the place of the worship of the pagan altars in the churches of God, according to his own⁴⁸ desire. And when the enemy of righteousness saw all this, defeated by the saint in spiritual combat he cried out in a loud voice in the hearing of all, and said, "Woe to me and mine, for we have been driven out of our dwelling here by Marut'a the servant of Christ, and we know not where to go; for the glory of Christ hath filled all the earth, and like smoke in the wind, we have been carried away from the midst thereof."

And the blessed Marut'a sealed with the cross of Christ the flock who believed in Him, in order that none should approach to seduce it; for like a spiritual [and] diligent husbandman he uprooted the thorns from the fields and the hearts of all, and sowed righteousness and holiness to the glory of God; for those who hearkened not to the prophets nor gave ear to the preaching of the apostles, God wished to bring the wanderers back by the hand of Marut'a to knowledge of the truth by the prayers and intercessions of all the saints who were gathered there. For the flock was without a shepherd, cast down by beasts, [that is] evil demons. And through this saint, Christ the good Shepherd, who gave his life for his sheep,⁴⁹ by his shepherd's staff, [that is] his life-giving cross, drove the demons away, and through him [Marut'a] he gathered them back to the unity of the faith and to the knowledge of the most holy Trinity by pasturing them in a verdant place; and, washing them in the waters of baptism and cleansing the impurity of their souls and their bodies, he

⁴⁷ Matthew 10, 8.

⁴⁸ Reading *norin* in place of *noroun?*

⁴⁹ John 10, 11.

brought them back to the divine fold which is the church of God; and he found the lost, he gathered the scattered, he healed the sick, that by spiritual birth and lustration and by the life-giving body and blood of the Saviour he might create anew sons of God the Father and heirs of Christ, who gave himself unto death for the salvation of his disciples; and he visited those who were far and near; and the light of the world shineth today through the blessed Marut'a. He was like Moses, who saved Israel from the Egyptian captivity and led them by a pillar of fire and cloud to the promised land; and by his courage and his zeal [he was] like Paul, who surpassed the first apostles both by signs and by miracles [and] moreover by most gracious letters, being the herald and the apostle of the world. In like manner the blessed Marut'a also was a preacher to the land and a teacher who, filled with all virtue, perfectly and by many miracles increased his flock day by day. And the Lord aided him in all ways; and he, who was taught by the Lord, desired all men to receive blessings, blessing his disciples and those who desired to become his companions. [23] And so, telling the truth with love, and obeying the precepts of the Gospel, he drove out from them their satanic imaginings and wicked thoughts, and by the truth which was taught them their religion and spiritual life were shaken by no one. And he himself more and more mortified himself by ascetic practices of all kinds, and he loved God with all his heart and all his might, and he practised righteousness in all things, so that I am not able to relate the wonders and miracles which the Lord manifested through him in all the land. And this happened in the three hundred and fourth [year] of the era of the Greeks, in the time of the younger Theodosius;⁵⁰ on behalf of this donor of divine favors, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, he went to Asorestan,⁵¹ that there also he might uproot the evil and iniquity of their customs through the power of Christ, and that he might reform the believers who, by the constraint of the Magians, kept the

⁵⁰ One ms. 'And this happened in the thirty-third [year] of the era of the Greeks, in the time of Theodosius, emperor of the Romans.' Another ms. 'And this happened in the eighty-third [year] in the era of the Greeks, in the twentieth year of the younger Theodosius, the pious. Text probably corrupt.'

⁵¹ Not Syria or Assyria, but Suristan. Cf. Marquart, *Evanšahr*.

church of God surrounded in darkness. And like a radiant light, by the grace of God he illumined believers and confounded the folly of the Magians and triumphantly manifested the truth; and the churches of God became glorious with daily worship.

And a report of the miracles of the holy bishop came to the Persian king Yazkert, who was a persecutor of the Christians, and he was summoned by him. When he came, the king with his nobles confronted the holy bishop. And he saw the divine grace upon the saint, and bowing down he prostrated himself before him in the presence of his courtiers. In like manner the saint of God prostrated himself before the king and saluted [him]. And he spoke good words, and the king loved the saint of God with all his heart by the heavenly inspiration of grace, for God wished to bring salvation to his servants by means of the love of the king for the saint. For Yazkert was a persecutor of the Christians in all the territory under his rule through his officers and the Magians and the Chief Magians. And by many torments they compelled the Christians to prostrate themselves before the sun and fire. Many who did not obey the command of the king became martyrs of Christ, and there was great oppression of the Christians and help from no place. And through the blessed one protection was given to the Christians by the Lord, and so [came] cessation of persecution and deliverance from prison and chains. The king had a very handsome son, and he was dearer to him than all his sons, and he was possessed by a very evil demon and found no healing from Magians or sorcerers or astrologers or any other source; and this misfortune came about by the providence of God, who was watching over the salvation of the multitude who believed in the Lord, that truth might be manifested by the wisdom of God and God be magnified and the horn of the church be exalted.⁵² And the king said to Marut'a, "I have a beloved son who is sore tormented by a demon and findeth healing nowhere, and I have great sorrow because of him; and now I entreat thee, O servant of the most high God, to ask God to heal my child, and that the demon leave him, and that he recover and live." And the saint

⁵² Psalm 89, 17, etc.

said, "Let thy son come, that I may see him." And when they brought him before all, the demon shrieked from the child, and said, "What have I to do with thee, servant of the crucified Christ? Thou hast come from a far land to drive me from my habitation." And he threw the child to the ground, and he [the child] was in great danger and fainted away. And his appearance was pitiful and lamentable, and terror seized them all. And there was another holy bishop with the blessed Marut'a, and he fell upon his face on the ground; and they prayed to the Lord and said: "Lord God Almighty, who [25] heardest the Canaanite woman who cried out to thee, and hadst compassion on her and dravest out the demon from her daughter⁵³ and didst heal her of the sickness of the demon, and drownedst their legion with the swine in the sea,⁵⁴ and also dravest many other demons out of men, some by thyself and some through thy disciples, on whom thou hadst compassion and wroughtest salvation through them; now, Lord of hosts, rebuke this evil one who is in this child, and let him be driven out of him, Almighty One, by thy name, and let all men know that thou alone art the true God. And let there be a cessation of the persecution of thy flock through this [child's] recovery. For thou art powerful over all things, and by thy glory every act is accomplished now and forevermore." And those who were with him having said Amen, he removed the demon; and he [the demon] screamed loudly, and said: "Woe is me, woe is me! From how glorious a dwelling have I been driven out!" And the child revived and came to his senses; and raising himself up he gave praise to God.

The king, seeing this, rejoiced, and said, "Verily the God of the Christians is greater than all the gods of the nations, for we have both heard and seen these great miracles [performed] by his servant." And the king said, "Now ask of me whatever thou desirest, and I will give it thee." And the blessed Marut'a said: "I desire nothing of thee save only that thou release the Christians from their prisons and chains and from their very grievous suffering; and that they be free to worship their God and rebuild the churches to the glory of the name of God in thy

⁵³ Matthew 15, 21-28; Mark 8, 24-30.

⁵⁴ Matthew 8, 28-34; Mark 5, 1-21; Luke 8, 26-40.

kingdom. Moreover show friendship to Theodosius, emperor of the Greeks, and let there be peace throughout the whole world through thee." And the king approved his words and performed all his requests.

And the good news was spread through the land by the decree of the king that the prisoners should be released from their chains and their torture, and that the churches should be rebuilt, and that they should freely worship their God, and that those who had persecuted and oppressed them should be punished by the royal command. And there was great mourning among the Magians, but among the believers [26] in Christ great rejoicing with praise and thanksgiving to God. And the prisoners who had been confined for the sake of Christ were released from their bonds, and [also] the nobles of Armenia. And there was great peace throughout the land of the king. And the Christians were permitted to rebuild the churches of God and to worship God freely.

After these things had happened in this way, he again requested the king to let him depart. And he [the king] gave him many gifts and messages of peace, and let him go to the Greek emperor. And the blessed one came to the pious Theodosius and saluted him and presented the decree of the king of the Persians. And when he had read it, he rejoiced greatly over his [Yazkert's] love and friendship for the Christians. And he asked the saint about everything; and he told him of the miracles that had been performed in the name of the Lord, and of the cessation of the persecutions. And he [the emperor] gave thanks to God, who had in his mercy wrought deliverance through the prayers of the saint. And he loved him more than all his patriarchs. And the pious Theodosius gave thanks and praise to God. And he inquired of [him], and was instructed by him as by a holy and worthy man. Finally he asked him what he desired. And the man of God requested the emperor to fortify the city of Cop'k⁶⁵ with a strong wall and to build a church to the glory of God in the midst of the city, wherein the sacrifice of Christ and praises of God might continually be performed; and that a certain number of all the saints might be

⁶⁵ Sophene; cf. Marquart, p. 171.

brought together; and that it should be named the City of Martyrs.⁵⁶ And the emperor said: "Thy words are good, and acceptable to God are thy designs. Therefore do as thou wilt, and the expenses of the building will be paid by me, as much as is needed." And he gave treasures of gold and silver, and craftsmen from the land of the Greeks and overseers and workmen as many as were needed. And furthermore he sent him off with all things and with a friendly reply by letter to the king of the Persians.

And when he came to the city of Çop'k' he began the building of the wall and assigned workmen to the work [27] and overseers over them, and he himself went to Pars, and other bishops with him. And when the king saw him, he received him and all those who were with him with honor; but Marut'a especially he cherished with great honor. And he [Marut'a] gave [him] the edict of the emperor Theodosius; and he [the king] rejoiced greatly in the letter and in the words of his message. And there was peace and friendship between both sovereigns until their death. Now the king had suffered from headaches for a long time, and no physician had helped him; and he told Marut'a. And he offered up prayers and laid his right hand upon the head of the king, and immediately he was healed by the name of Christ. And never again did any headache trouble the king. And his love and admiration for the saint increased still more, for he recognized that truly God was with him.

And the Magians growing envious planned to lay a trap for the man of God that they might cause him to lose the friendship of the king. And, using deceit in the same manner as the Babylonians did toward Daniel in the reign of Darius,⁵⁷ they also made a subterranean chamber⁵⁸ underneath the fire-temple, and they placed a man within it and instructed him to say to the king,⁵⁹ "I do not accept thy adoration because thou hast loved the Christian priest⁶⁰ who hath counselled thee to despise

⁵⁶ *Martirosaq K' alak'*, Martyropolis, modern Maipherkat, Arabic Mayyafāraqīn. See Marquart, p. 161; Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen*, pp. 308–309. In this Vita it is also called Çop'k' and Np'ärkert.

⁵⁷ Bel and the Dragon 13 ff. (*Vulgata*, Daniel 14, 12 ff.).

⁵⁸ One ms. 'a very small chamber.'

⁵⁹ One ms. 'they put words in his mouth to say to the king,' etc.

⁶⁰ One ms. 'priests.'

my ministers.' And when the king, in accordance with his custom, came to worship the fire, the man interrupted him with a loud cry and startled the king. And a voice which seemed to him to come from out the fire said, 'Get thee hence, thou impious one, I do not accept thy adoration, for thou hast joined thyself to the Christian who hath seduced thee to the worship of the Crucified, and hath counselled thee to despise my ministers.'⁶¹ And when the king heard [this], he was affrighted, and went out and remained troubled and perplexed and confused in his thoughts; and he waited for the saint to speak. And [28] the blessed Marut'a knew their trickery by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and approaching he said, 'O king, return to worship the fire, and uncover the place whence the voice was heard, and thou wilt know the fraud of the Magians.' And he returned to the place and heard the same voice; and he commanded the place to be uncovered whence he had heard the voice. They uncovered [it] and drew the man out from the place, and he revealed to the king those who had practised the deception; and he [the king] put them to death. And the others did evil a second time, and made an abominable odor⁶² about the king's throne; and he questioned the Magians, and they accused Marut'a and the bishops who were with him. And the king investigated and ascertained who had done it, and these also he delivered to death. And the wicked envy of the Chief Magians and of the Persian nobles increased still more, and they determined to kill even the king and Marut'a. And he who was next [in rank] to the king and more beloved and more illustrious and more powerful than all the Persian nobles, when he saw the death of the Magians, wished to avenge the worshippers of fire. And in his house he dug a deep hole⁶³ and set up in it sharp swords⁶⁴ and placed over them a divan and a seat for the king, of precious and beautiful and splendid stuffs, that when he sat down he might fall below and be pierced by the sword and die. And he invited the king and Marut'a to

⁶¹ Two mss. 'and to despise me and my ministers.' Compare the Syriac life of St. Ephraem, ed. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik*, 4th ed., p. 24.*

⁶² In Zoroastrianism an evil odor is a sign of the presence of demons.

⁶³ One ms. 'a pit.'

⁶⁴ Two mss. 'two swords.'

dine. And God made his evil plan clear to Saint Marut'a, and the saint came to the king secretly, and said: "Because I have found favor before thee, and thou hast shown mercy to the Christians, guard thyself, and mark what I say, which the Lord hath revealed to me. The man who hath invited thee to dine hath prepared a death-trap for thee, a pit under the seat, and hath set up swords therein, that when thou wilt seat thyself thou mayest fall below upon them and die." When the king heard this, he was affrighted and said: "What thou sayest seemeth incredible. Why doth he plan my death, having been so much loved and honored by me, more than [29] all?" Marut'a said, "Go not to that dinner, but if thou goest, seat him in thy seat which he hath prepared for thee." And the king said, "So be it." And the noble came and invited the king and Marut'a with many entreaties. And they went and entered where the seat had been prepared for the king. And the king commanded him to sit in his place. And the other said, "Why should thy servant sit in the king's place?" And the king insisted, and the other wept and entreated and fell on his knees. But his entreaties were not heard. And he [the king] gave command for his soldiers to take and throw him upon the seat. And when they threw him upon the seat, he fell into the pit upon the swords and died. And when the king saw what had happened, and verified what the saint had said, he cried out in a loud voice, and said, "Great is the God of the Christians who hath revealed secrets to them that love him."

And because of these things the blessed one was loved and honored by the king; and the king believed in the true God, and willingly he listened to the saint. But he was afraid to reveal his belief to his nobles, lest the Persians rise against him and kill him and take away his kingship. And on the next day the king summoned all his great nobles and related to them all that had happened and how he had been saved by the blessed Marut'a, who had warned him beforehand of the death-trap. And they all said, "Let him be extolled and honored, and let him be worthy of very great presents from the king and from all the nobles." And he said, "So shall it be as ye have said." And a decree went out from the king that whatever Marut'a

should desire to do, should be done by his authority. And the blessed Marut'a praised God and said: "Blessed art thou, Lord God, who hast delivered the king from a treacherous death. And now let there be peace and friendship toward the Christians and toward the emperor of the Greeks⁶⁵ for ever and ever." And he [the king] stretched out his gold sceptre toward [30] the saint before all his great men and said, "Whatever thou desirest shall be given thee."⁶⁶ And he prostrated himself before the king, and he went out of his presence giving thanks and praise to God.

And he gathered the remains of the martyrs of Christ who had been put to death by the Magians and the king, and he assembled them from different places into a sepulchre with great honor by the command of the king; and taking some relics from all the remains, he carried them with him to the City of Martyrs. And he was sent away by the king with a message of peace and many gifts, [among them] a cup of gold in memory of the king, full of gold for the building-material of the church which had been built in the city under the dedication of 'The Martyrs of God.' And seeing the skilfulness of the construction of the city and of the church of God, he praised God. And he returned again to the pious Theodosius; and he related to him his friendship and peace with the king, and the cessation of the persecutions and the rebuilding of the churches of God and the collecting of the relics into sepulchres and the carrying of a part of them to the City of Martyrs; and all the miracles that the Lord had performed through him, and how he had saved the king from death; and what the king of the Persians had truly written to Theodosius, emperor of the Greeks. And when he [the emperor] read this, he rejoiced, and with thanksgiving praised God Almighty for all his exceeding great wonders and for God's care of those who believed in him who was manifested through him [Marut'a]. And he extolled and honored the blessed Marut'a even more than before. And he asked of the emperor that he issue a decree for him to gather from the remains of all the saints in his empire some relics to carry to the

⁶⁵ One ms. 'toward the king of the Persians' (i. e., between the Christians and the Persian king).

⁶⁶ Esther 5, 2-3.

City of Martyrs, as he had himself said before; and he received permission to do whatever he wished; and he went out to Rome⁶⁷ and to all the cities and provinces and villages and monasteries and hermitages, and gathered relics with the help of God. And he returned to the pious Theodosius, and great was the joy of the emperor. And he gave many gifts and villages and farms and vineyards and olive groves, all fruitbearing, to the churches of God, and to the martyrs who were [31] gathered in the city.⁶⁸ And he sent him away full of joy, as the blessed one desired.

And arriving in his own land, in the city of Cop'k', with a glad heart, he gave thanks to God. And the city and churches of God were built with marvellous construction, and he made altars within the walls of the house of God and placed reliquaries within them, arranging them with admirable skill; [and he gathered the relics] from the kingdom of the Romans, one hundred and twenty thousand, and from that of Asorestan⁶⁹ twenty thousand, and from the kingdom of the Persians eighty thousand, and from our kingdom⁷⁰ sixty thousand; altogether the number of the relics of the saints brought together was two hundred and eighty thousand. I omit those which were collected afterwards, and also the holy martyrs who died in that city and remain there, by whose intercession may the Lord be merciful to us who have translated the Passions from Syriac into Armenian, [namely] I, Gagig,⁷¹ and my deacon Grigor who is with me — may they [and] all believers be worthy of a part in the inheritance of the saints who are gathered there! And so with gladness and with great zeal Marut'a gathered the relics of the martyrs in the city of Np'ərkert, whose names are written in the Book of Life. And throughout the days of the blessed one the Lord kept peace between the two sovereigns of the Greeks and of the Persians, and [there was] a cessation of persecution, and a rebuilding of the church to the glory of his holy name.

⁶⁷ That is, Byzantium.

⁶⁸ One ms. 'the City of Martyrs.'

⁶⁹ Here, probably, Syria or Assyria or both.

⁷⁰ Armenia, the country of the translator.

⁷¹ Two mss. 'Father Gagik.'

After all this came the end of the blessed Marut'a in the month of June,⁷² on the first day, in the City of Martyrs. And he was praised and extolled before the relics of all the saints by all the holy men and the people who were believers, because through him God had given salvation to the whole land, and he had converted [men] from godlessness to true knowledge of God [32] and from impiety to righteousness. Let us not neglect the teachings handed down by the blessed father touching the orthodox faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and which is the word of faith regarding the dispensation of the Son, who was united to a body and performed righteousness in all things, incorruptibly to revivify our vile flesh in the likeness of his glorious body by divine dispensation,⁷³ and who spake concerning goodness and holiness and a life of complete austerity, that we might live by the Spirit and despise the desires of the flesh, and that we might attain to a portion of an inheritance in him and in all the saints gathered in him⁷⁴ to the glory of the most holy Trinity.

And it came to pass after the death of these kings that Kawat,⁷⁵ the grandson of Yazkert, collected his armies and came into the territory of the Greeks, to the city of Np'ärkert, to take it. And the inhabitants of the city were in dire straits, and because of the danger which threatened them they determined to give the cup of gold, filled with gold, for the deliverance of the city, the same which his [Kawat's] grandfather had given as a gift⁷⁶ to the blessed Marut'a. And when it was brought before the king, and he read the name of his grandfather which was written upon the cup, he wept and said: "Far be it from me to take the memorial of my fathers, or to do evil to this city. But let there be friendship and peace between me and the city [all] the days of my life." And he returned in peace to his own land; and the city and the whole land were delivered

⁷² One ms. 'in January, on the 21st day'; another ms. 'on the 21st day of the month of June.' The dates are given in Roman nomenclature, and the numbers are written in cipher, by letters of the alphabet.

⁷³ Philippians 3, 21.

⁷⁴ Literally 'there.'

⁷⁵ Kawādh I, who reigned 488–531 A.D. and was the grandson of Yezdegerd II (438–452 A.D.) not Yezdegerd I.

⁷⁶ One ms. 'which had been given by Yazkert his grandfather as a gift.'

and saved from their evil fate.⁷⁷ And they recognized and knew that through the intercession of the saints who were gathered there, and of the blessed Marut'a, the Lord had wrought the salvation of the city and the land. And to him who delivereth and saveth them that hope and trust in him be praise now and forevermore and for all eternity. Amen.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the above was put into type I have been able to consult J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* (*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXXVII), Paris, 1902, with Syriac text and a French translation. This is a collection of Nestorian documents relating to various synods from 410 on, made according to Chabot toward the end of the eighth century in the patriarchate of Timothy I (780–823). For the existence of such records Marutha was largely responsible. Indeed Chabot gives as the first of the three canonical sources of Nestorian history “un recueil de synodes occidentaux transmis par Marouta de Maipherqat en 410 et auquel furent ensuite ajoutés les canons du concile de Chalcédoine.”

Of the account of proceedings at the Synod of Seleucia, agreeing in general with those given in the other Syriac sources, only a brief summary can be given here.

After a eulogy of the catholicus Isaac and Marutha, who are given credit for a reformation of the Eastern church and for Yezdegerd's favorable attitude toward Christianity, this source tells us that the bishops of the West, that is, those in Byzantine territory, wrote a Greek letter on the subject of the church discipline to Marutha with a request that it be conveyed to the Persian king. Marutha secretly showed it to his colleague Isaac, and with him translated it into Persian and had it read before Yezdegerd, who upon hearing its contents exclaimed, “The East and the West shall be one empire under the authority of my rule (*hadh šultana l^eūhdānā d^emalkūth*(i)**”). He also issued orders to his provincial governors (*marz^ebhānē*) to see that the local bishops in the Persian empire be summoned to a

⁷⁷ Compare the story of the ransom of the Christian captives of Ba'arbāyā and Mesopotamia in Mārī ibn Sulaimān above.

synod at Seleucia, over which Isaac and Marutha were to preside. Accordingly they assembled, to the number of forty, on the sixth of January (Epiphany), 410 A.D., and on February first they heard the letter of the Western bishops, which contained three propositions, concerning the election and authority of bishops, the observance of church festivals, and the acceptance of the canons of the Council of Nicaea. All these propositions were favorably received, and at Marutha's suggestion the bishops signed their names to a formal document of ratification, with Isaac and Marutha heading the list.

A few days later, through the influence of these two leaders, the Eastern bishops were granted an audience with Yezdegerd, who informed them that he would confirm the appointment of any ecclesiastical head (*rēšā*) of whom Isaac and Marutha should approve.

Finally, we have a Syriac version of the Nicene creed and the text of the twenty-one canons adopted at the Synod of Seleucia, the thirteenth of which provides for adherence on the part of the Eastern church to the order of services, or form of ministry (*tešmeštā*), of the West, which Isaac and Marutha had taught them.

Another interesting event in Marutha's career is related in connection with the account of the synod of Markabta in 420, at which Agapit, bishop of Beit Laphat, alluded to earlier dissensions in the church when rebellious bishops tried to set up a rival to the catholicus Isaac and to turn Yezdegerd against him. At the instance of the Byzantine court Marutha was sent to restore order. With the consent of Yezdegerd he convened a synod and disposed of the troublesome bishops. There is no precise indication of the date of this second synod, which, however, must have been held before 420, when Yahabalaha was catholicus.

IS THERE A LECTIONARY TEXT OF THE GOSPELS?

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DO THE majority of the Greek lectionaries of the gospels agree with one another so consistently that it is possible to speak of their text as "the lectionary text"? It has generally been assumed that the text of lectionaries does not merit serious attention, and that even if they should agree in text, the quality of that text would not justify its study.¹ But the discussion of the quality and significance of this text may reasonably be postponed until its existence has been established.²

The complete proof that there is a distinct lectionary text must await the collation of a considerable number of mss., but enough evidence can be advanced to show that the existence of such a distinct text is highly probable, if not certain.³ This evidence was obtained by sampling the text of a fair number of lectionaries — twenty-six lections⁴ in from five to fifty-six mss. having been collated with Lloyd's edition of the *Textus Receptus* (Oxford, 1894). These twenty-six passages fall into three groups on the basis of the extent of their difference from Stephanus. (1) In seven of these sample lections the variants

¹ This is the position, for instance, of von Soden (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I. i. 19 f.), who excluded lectionaries from his studies.

² The Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago is carrying on as a research project under the direction of Professor D. W. Riddle and the author an exhaustive investigation of the text of the lectionaries. Our plans look ultimately to the publication of a critical edition of the lectionary text. Some progress has already been made in the collation of mss., and we hope to publish a volume of Prolegomena within the next few years. Our studies, as far as they have gone, indicate that the lectionary text has a valuable contribution to make to the early history as well as to the mediaeval history of the text of the New Testament.

³ A large part of the evidence which follows was collected in the summer of 1930 in a three-months' study of the lectionaries in the Bodleian Library, the British Museum, the John Rylands Library, and the Bibliothèque Nationale.

⁴ By 'lection' is meant the section of the gospels read at one service; thus, the 'lection' for Easter Sunday is John 1, 1-17.

from Stephanus are neither considerable enough nor consistent enough to imply the existence of a lectionary text except in so far as that text is practically identical with Stephanus. (2) In fourteen lections the variants are not very numerous or decisive, and yet occur regularly enough to suggest a lectionary text distinct from Stephanus. (3) In five lections the variants are so numerous and consistent as to demonstrate the existence of a lectionary text distinct from that of Stephanus.

(1) The rather neutral evidence of the first group of seven lections must be interpreted in the light of the evidence of the two following groups. When so interpreted, it plainly indicates the existence of the lectionary text here also, but shows that it practically coincides with the text of Stephanus in these lections. Three⁵ of these lections are from the Synaxarion (for the movable year), and four⁶ are from the Menology (for the fixed year). In each of these lections the agreement of the lectionaries with each other is too close to be accidental, and the number of variants from Stephanus is trifling. Almost any one of the mss. which contain the text of Stephanus would be found to differ more from the printed text than do the forty lectionaries here used. This can easily be illustrated from the collations published by Scrivener (20 mss.), which, for the lections in question, show an average departure of three readings each from the printed text. As is well known, the printed text of Stephanus as a whole is not a perfect reproduction of the readings of any New Testament codex.

TABLE I

 β' of $\gamma' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of John (4, 46–54) in 40 lectionaries

Total number of variants	57
Average number of variants per lectionary	$1\frac{1}{3}$
No variant from Stephanus in	12 lectionaries
One variant from Stephanus in	12 lectionaries

Similar figures could be given for the other six lections of this group. In four of them the average variation from the text

⁵ β' of $\gamma' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of John (4, 46–54); $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\sigma\tau\gamma'$ of John (15, 17–16, 2); $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\sigma\tau\gamma'$ of Matthew (7, 24–8, 4).

⁶ κυριακὴ πρὸ τῶν φύτων (Mark 1, 1–8); September 3 (John 10, 9–16); June 24 (Luke 1, 1–15); and ἐσθιτόν γ' (Mark 16, 9–20).

TABLE II

In the tables, x indicates that the ms. shows the variant. The letters, a, b, c, etc., indicate a different variant (given in the notes below the table). The absence of any sign indicates agreement with Stephanus' text of 1550. Since the lectionaries were collated once only, there are probably some errors in the tables. 'Incipit' is the opening formula, the adaptation of the text necessary for the beginning of an independent section.

In $\alpha = \pi\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\alpha$ for $\pi\epsilon\nu$ α is α for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, ν is ν for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, η is η for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, τ is τ for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, α is α for $\pi\epsilon\nu$. In $\beta = \pi\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\alpha$ for $\pi\epsilon\nu$ α is α for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, ν is ν for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, η is η for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, τ is τ for $\pi\epsilon\nu$, α is α for $\pi\epsilon\nu$.

10, 4 8 = $\pi \alpha \rho \sigma \delta \nu \delta \sigma \nu$.

of Stephanus is less than one variant per lectionary; the highest amount of variation, in $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu \gamma'$ of Matthew, is 1.6 variant per lectionary. This seems to indicate that the text of the great body of lectionaries is a unit even in those areas where it differs least from Stephanus.

(2) The fourteen lections in which the lectionary text differs enough from the Textus Receptus to suggest its existence as a separate entity without completely establishing it are drawn from both parts of the lectionary, but mainly from the Synaxarion.⁷ The extent of agreement among lectionaries in these sections can be seen in the lection for Monday of the third week of Matthew (see Table II, page 75).

The twenty-six lectionaries used date from the 10th through the 14th century.⁸ One other lectionary, Gregory's 364, was studied, but it contains a different section of the gospel at this point. The table shows plainly the majority of the lectionaries supporting four variants in addition to the opening formula. Only one of these four variants is supported by the majority of contemporary non-lectionary mss., as adduced by Tischendorf.

Similar phenomena can be seen in almost every one of these lections, most strikingly perhaps in the lection for Tuesday of the third week of Luke (see Table III).

TABLE III

 γ' of $\gamma' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of Luke (6, 37–45) in 23 lectionaries

Variants from Stephanus	Other support
6, 44 $\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu$ for $\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu$ (16 lects.)	U al pauc (Lect. 49)
6, 44 tr. $\sigma\tau\alpha\phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\nu \tau\rho\gamma\omega\sigma\nu$ (16 lects.)	NBCDLXΞ 13 33 69 346 al pauc (Lect. 49)
6, 45 omit $\tau\omega\nu$ 3° (15 lects.)	NABDEHKSVXΔΞΛΠ al 20
6, 45 omit $\tau\eta\varsigma$ 3° (13 lects.)	NABDΞ al plus 10
6, 45 omit $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 3° (17 lects.)	CF al 20 fere

⁷ $\kappa\mu\iota\alpha\kappa\delta'$ of John (5, 1–15); β' of $\gamma' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of Matthew (9, 36–10, 8); $\kappa\mu\iota\alpha\kappa\iota\alpha'$ of Matthew (18, 23–35); γ' of $\gamma' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of Luke (6, 37–45); $\kappa\mu\iota\alpha\kappa\epsilon'$ of Luke (16, 19–31); δ' of $\iota\epsilon' \epsilon\beta\delta.$ of Luke, Mark (11, 23–27); $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu \beta'$ of Lent, Mark (1, 35–45); $\kappa\mu\iota\alpha\kappa\epsilon'$ of Lent, Mark (10, 32–45); $\alpha\gamma\iota\alpha \gamma' \pi\rho\omega\iota$, Matthew (22, 15–25 [–46]); $\omega\rho\alpha \gamma'$, Mark (15, 16–41); $\alpha\gamma\iota\alpha \gamma' \lambda\epsilon\iota\tau.$, Matthew (24, 36–25, 18); January 6 $\delta\rho\theta\rho\sigma$, Mark (1, 9–11); $\pi\kappa\theta\sigma \theta'$, John (19, 25b–37); $\pi\kappa\theta\sigma \zeta'$, Matthew (27, 33–54).

⁸ The numbers given to the mss. in the Table are Gregory's lectionary numbers.

These five variants are all found in the same thirteen lectionaries; seven of the thirteen contain no other variant.

In addition, 13 variants occur (seven of these being unrecorded by Tischendorf), of which 9 are found in one lectionary each, 2 in two lectionaries, 1 in three lectionaries, and 1 in five lectionaries.

These two lections are typical of the entire group of fourteen; in these lections the lectionaries agree in a text which differs slightly from that of Stephanus and is not found in any known non-lectionary codex.

(3) In the next group of lections (five in number) the variants from Stephanus are so numerous and so consistently supported that their evidence is decisive.

The evidence of three of these is given in full (Tables IV-VI).

Table IV shows that of the twenty-four lectionaries whose text is known for this lection, seventeen agree quite consistently in supporting eleven significant variants. This consistency is the more remarkable in view of the diverse character of the other attestation. Of the remaining lectionaries, three (7, 101, 15) agree in a text that differs slightly from Stephanus and largely from the lectionary text as found in the group of seventeen. Three more (76, 14, 86) agree with Stephanus; and one (8) seems to have a lectionary text which has been partially corrected to conform to the *Textus Receptus*.

The most valuable material for a check on the study of the text of late manuscripts is Lake's collation of about 120 such for Mark, chapter 11.⁹ The difference between lectionaries and other mss. can be easily seen by comparing them in this section of Mark. Lake remarks upon the large number of variants and the absence of close relation between codices. But the astonishing thing about lectionaries is the very close relation between them. Seventeen out of twenty-four lectionaries support quite faithfully eleven variants in this lection, Mark 11, 11-23. That this agreement is not accidental can be seen by noting the number of lectionaries and the number of codices reported on by Lake that support these eleven variants.

	Variant number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Out of 24 lectionaries		17	17	16	16	18	16	17	19	16	19	15
Out of Lake's 120 codices		1	2	9	16	0	12	2	60	0	45	24

⁹ Harvard Theological Review, XXI, October 1928, 349-357.

TABLE IV

γ' of $\iota\beta\delta$, of Luke (Mark 11, 11-23) in 24 lectures
(The statements about 251 and 260 are drawn from Muralt.)

Incip. o = *es iepor, o troos*, 76 is torn here, and the evidence for 251 and 260 is not available. 14 o = $\phi\alpha\gamma\eta$. 17 o = omit autroy. 23 o = *ποτεῖν*.

The following variants have no (or very little) support elsewhere:

- 13 add *επ αυτην* after *εγενησαν*
 13 add *και* before *η θεος* 233
 14 70 has a variant here which I have lost.
 15 *τραπεζας* for *καθθος* 184, 364
 15 *ευθυνης* και for *ευειδων* 150
 15 om *εις* 361
 16 δε for *και* 7
 18 *και* for *οι* 80
 21 *εχησαν* for *εκησαν* 8, 364, 14
 23 *ειπεν* before *προσειπεν* 70

The uniformity of lectionary support for these variants and the wide variation in the support found among other codices show that here there is a lectionary text distinct from that of late MSS. in general.

Another striking instance of the agreement of lectionaries is found in another lection in this group of five, that from the Gospel of John for September 14 (see Table V).

The entire lection, John 19, 6–35, was collated in the forty-four MSS., but only the first half of the lection is shown in the Table. In this first half, the following variants have no (or very little) support elsewhere:

19, 6	omit <i>πιλατος</i>	152	19, 17	<i>γαβαθα</i> for <i>γολγοθα</i>	328
19, 6	tr. <i>αιτιαν εν αυτω</i>	318	19, 17	<i>εξηλθον</i> for <i>εξηλθεν</i>	7, 188, 373
19, 11	omit <i>κατ εμου</i>	369	19, 17	<i>τοπον</i> for <i>τον 2o</i>	13, 16
19, 14	omit <i>δε ωσει</i>	366			

One lectionary (329) differs so widely from the rest that its text cannot easily be shown in the same table.

In the second half of the lection, which does not appear in the Table, the chief variants with their support are as follows (the total number of lectionaries supporting the variant, and not the numbers of individual lectionaries, is given):

19, 17	<i>εαυτον</i> for <i>αυτον</i>	(29 lects.)	AIUY min (Lect. 135)
19, 20	tr. <i>ο τοπος της πολεως</i>	(40 lects.)	N ^a ABD ^{supp} ILXYΓΑΠ unc ⁶ minn longe plu
19, 21—25	(<i>εποιησαν</i>) omit	(42 lects.)	none
19, 26	<i>ιδε</i> for <i>ιδον</i>	(44 lects.)	BD ^{supp} MT ^d X ^a al 80 fere
19, 27	<i>ημερας</i> for <i>ωρας</i>	(37 lects.)	AE ¹ vid al 40
19, 27	add <i>εκεινος</i> after <i>μαθητης</i>	(42 lects.)	UΓ al 50
19, 28	<i>ταντα</i> for <i>τοντο</i>	(33 lects.)	U al 30
19, 28	omit <i>ηδη</i>	(41 lects.)	fam 1, 565 al plus 30
19, 28	add <i>περι αυτου</i> after <i>τετελεσται</i>	(40 lects.)	UM ^{mg} al pl 20
19, 28	(<i>ινα τελεσθω</i>) — 30 (<i>τετελεσται</i>)	omit (44 lects.)	no others
19, 34	<i>ενθεως</i> for <i>ενθυς</i>	(44 lects.)	D ^{supp} GMUYΓ al plus 60
19, 35	tr. <i>εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου</i>	(44 lects.)	HY al 60

In this lection the agreement of the lectionaries is most striking. In twenty-nine verses the majority of the forty-five lectionaries collated agreed in twenty-five variants. If the four

TABLE V

Liturgy, September 14 (John 19, 6-17) in 44 lectionaries

Other support	Variants from Stephanus
none	7-9a (<i>πρετωριον</i>) omit
none	7 tr. <i>θεου νιον</i>
STΔA 127 al 25	9 o πιλατος for και 2°
M ^{mag} 2	10 tr. <i>απολυσαι . . . σταυ-</i>
NABE*	<i>φροσαι</i>
	10 omit ονη
	11 omit ο 1°
	11 omit αδημαν
	11 omit δια . . . 12 end
	13 τοε ονη for ο ονη
	13 γαβα for γαβαθα
	14 η for δε 2°
	15 εκρακον for εκραγαρ
	15 add λεγοντες after εκ-
	16 παραλαβοντες for παρ-
	16 ελαβον
	16 omit και
	16 γηγαγον for απηγαγω
	16 add εις το παριτωρον
	17 27 131 (Lect. 135)
	MUT 127 262 299 al permu
	17 o for os
	135)
	*+*ΜUΠΙ ² fam 1 (Lect.
	135)
	16 γηγαγον for απηγαγω
	16 add εις το παριτωρον
	NABK 157 440 al 20 (Lect.
	135)

Incipit = τ. κ. ε. συμβούλιον επιστρατον αρχιερεως και ο πρεβιτηρος κατα του ιησου σπως αυτων αποδεικνυν και παρεγενοτρο προς πιλατον λεγοντος απον αριστηρων αυτον λεγει.

Incip. ο = utopera for περιπτέροι. omit οπώς : πατάτω και ελαφρώς γεύεται.

variants which involve the omission of ten and a half verses be disregarded, there remain twenty-one variants in eighteen and a half verses. Only four lectionaries differ from the majority sufficiently to be classified as having other than the lectionary text, and the text of three of these (2, 16, 366) is indicated in Table V. Furthermore it should be noted that here, as elsewhere, the highly divergent character of the supporting attestation throws the close agreement of the lectionaries into bold relief.

Of the two preceding lections one comes from the Synaxarion and one from the Menology. The following lection comes from the Easter season and shows the same high agreement of lectionaries.

TABLE VI

Liturgy, πάθος s' (Mark 15, 16-32a)

Incip. τ. κ. ε. οι στρατιωται απηγαγον τον ιησον εις την αυλην του καιαφα ο (44 lects.)

15, 18 ο βασιλευς for βασιλευ (50 lects.) AC²EFGHKNUTΓΠ al plus 110

15, 24 διαμεριζονται for διεμεριζον (36 lects.) ΝABCDLPXΓΔΠ unc⁹ fam 1 al plus 130

[διεμεριζοντο (7 lects.) 69, 124, al 15 fere]

15, 28 omit verse (48 lects.) ΝABC¹⁺³DX al 25 fere item Eus canon ut vdtr

15, 32 add αυτω after πιστευσωμεν (39 lects.) C³DFGHM¹PV²ΓΠ² al 80
[add εις αυτον (5 lects.) al pauc]

In addition to these, the lectionaries show approximately 38 variants, of which 33 are supported by less than 5 lectionaries. The other five variants are supported by from 5 to 21 lectionaries. It is worthy of note that the two variants which are supported by the highest number of lectionaries are very differently supported by non-lectionary mss., the first being supported by more than 110, and the second by about 25. Here again the lectionaries agree with one another in readings where contemporary non-lectionary mss. do not agree with one another.

The agreement of lectionaries with one another can also be shown by comparing some collations made in Paris last sum-

TABLE VII

Comparison of two sets of lectionaries

¹ Lectio 12, 70, 69, and 10 are here cited from fresh collations. 150 is H of Scrivener (Excerpt from the Codex Augiensis, 1859), and 185 'Scrivener's z' (A Full and Exact Collation, 1853). 184 is Scrivener's y (*Ibid.*, 251 (Greg.) is 3 of Muralt, and 260 (Greg.) Muralt's 10. The column headed Orl. 4000 gives the evidence of the Patriarchate Greek New Testament (Constantinople, 1904), which is based on lectioaries.

Only those variants of WH from Stephanus which are also found in one or more lectionaries are noted in the Table.

Lect. 260 is the only one of the lectioaries consulted which seriously departs from the ‘lectioinary text’; to a remarkable degree its departures agree with WH. Its readings are known only through a collation sent to Muralt from Odessa, and the present location of the lectioary itself is unknown.

ϵ' of $\iota\delta'\epsilon\beta\delta$. of Matthew (Mark 5, 1-20)

¶ABC KL MΔΠ ^{text} al plus 25	9 λέγειν αὐτῷ for απειροθη λέγων	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
AM al 20	10 tr. αποστελγαντος	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
unc omn minn 150	11 τῷ ορει for τῷ ὅρῃ	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
AKII ^{ext} al plus 15	11 tr. πρὸς τῷ ορει to end	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
DLU 131 al pauc	11 omit μεγαλη	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
U al	13 αυτοὺς for αὐτούς	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶BCLΔ 1 28 102 118 131 209 al pauc	13 omit εὐθέας οὐτούς	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶BC'DLΔ 1 565	13 omit ησαν δε	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABCDLMA al 25	14 καὶ οὐ for οὐ δε	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶BCDLΔ 13 69 124 346 565	14 αὐτοὺς for τοὺς χαρούς	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABCD KLM ^{III} al 35	14 απαγγελαν for απαγγελαν	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
no attestation	14 omit εε̄ς 2°	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABKLMU ^{III} * 33 al 30	14 ηλθον for εξηλθον	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Δ 472	15 omit καθημενον	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
M ¹	15 omit καὶ ματσμενον	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABCD KLM ^{III} 1 33 124 al 25	18 εμβαυρόντος for εμβαυτος	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABCKLMΔΠ ^{text} 1 28 33 69 al 25	18 tr. μετ αυτον η	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABC KLM ^{III} 1 33 102 al 30	19 καὶ for ο δε γηρούς	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶BCΔ al pauc	19 απαγγελον for απαγγελον	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
BCΔ	19 tr. ο κύριος στ	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
¶ABC LII unc ³ al 100	19 πεπονηκεν for επονησε	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

10 a = αποστελην αυτον

The only other variants in these MSS. are without support elsewhere; they are:

3 κατοκινα 185

4 συντριψθαι 185

9 μου for μου 70

11 τῷ ορει for τῷ γοτ 184

16 omit πῶς εγένετο 70

18 add πολλα after αυτον 260

13 omit ων 251

10 omit εισηλθον 260

18 add πολλα after αυτον 260

mer with published collations of lectionaries. In Mark 5, 1-20 I collated the text of four lectionaries selected at random in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Table VII shows the agreement of these four with the text of five lectionaries published by Scrivener and Muralt. One of the five is 184, British Museum, Burney 22, which Scrivener, Gregory, and Hort regarded as having an unusually good text. Yet this lectionary has in this lection, out of twenty-two variants, only two which are not supported by other lectionaries.¹⁰ The only one of the nine lectionaries to disagree with the majority is 260, and its disagreement lies in the possession of eight variants in addition to eighteen variants supported by the other lectionaries.

A further hint as to the extent of the agreement of lectionaries is found in the text of two lectionaries, 12 and 70, selected at random, which were collated throughout Mark, in so far as the text of Mark appears in 52 lections for week-days in the Synaxarion. Codex 12 has 302 variants from Stephanus; Codex 70 has 352; and they agree in 288 variants. About one-tenth of the variants in which they agree have no attestation of any kind in Tischendorf's apparatus criticus.

Thus we see that lectionaries agree with one another in lections taken from the Synaxarion and in lections taken from the Menology. They agree in lections where their text is practically identical with the Textus Receptus, and they agree where their text differs widely from the Textus Receptus. Whether a small number of lectionaries are compared in a large number of lections or a large number of lectionaries are compared in a small number of lections, the result is the same: they agree with one another. This agreement is the more significant when it is noted that the support from non-lectionary MSS. varies in both kind and amount; and even where there is no other support, the agreement of lectionary with lectionary is as close as ever. Such agreement justifies speaking of the text of lectionaries as 'the lectionary text.'

¹⁰ A study of the variants read by 184 in Tables II and IV will show the same high agreement with other lectionaries. And the same is true in six out of eight other lections in which a comparison is possible.

NOTES

A PATMOS FAMILY OF GOSPEL MANUSCRIPTS

IN THE excursus on the 'Ecclesiastical Text,' appended to the study of the Caesarean Text of Mark, it was pointed out that four MSS., 1169, 1173, 1204, and 1385, form a closely related group.¹ A visit to Sinai and Patmos this year has made it possible to collate the gospel of Mark in all four codices and to photograph the three at Patmos. The relation between the three Patmos MSS. now reveals itself as much closer than was supposed, but the Sinai MS. has evidently been copied from two archetypes.

The group consists of the following MSS.:

I. Patmos 274 (Gregory 1385; von Soden 1304). This appears as the oldest of the group and is probably the archetype. It is a well written manuscript of the early 12th century (the date assigned by von Soden is too late) with very good miniatures, an example of which is given herewith.

II. Patmos 96 (Gregory 1173; von Soden 1303). 13th century.

III. Patmos 90 (Gregory 1169; von Soden 1232). In contrast to the others this is a paper manuscript, a fact which makes von Soden's dating doubtful. The hand, however, forbids a date later than the 13th century.

IV. Sinai 167 (Gregory 1204; von Soden 1251). 12th century.

The following collation with Lloyd's Oxford edition of the *Textus Receptus* (1894) gives those variants which are supported by two out of three of the Patmos MSS. Variants which are also supported by 1204 are indicated by an asterisk. The variants in which the several manuscripts depart from the family text are given separately at the close of the second list.

PATMOS GROUP

i. 6	*ο Ιωαννης	17	αλιεις αιθρωπων γενεσθαι
	*ην εσθιων	26	απ αυτου
9	*ο Ιησους	27	εαυτους
10	καταβαινον] + και μενον		λεγοντες
12	ευθεως		αυτω] αυτου
16	*αυτου] + τον Σιμωνος	33	συνηγμενη

¹ Harvard Theological Review, XXI, 1928, p. 346.

i.	36 κατεδιωξεν	38 επι] εν
	37 *σε ᾧητουσι	40 *ουτως
	38 *και εκει	v. 2 υπηντησεν
	40 γονυπετων αυτω	3 *μνημασιν
	οι αυτω	11 *τα ορη] τω ορει
	45 οι και ηρχοντο προς αυτον	15 οι και post καθημενον
	πανταχοθεν	16 διηγησαντο
ii.	1 και εισηλθεν ο Ιησους παλιν	19 *πεποιηκε
	8 οι αυτου	22 εις] τις
	οι οτι ουτως διαλογιζονται	24 ηκολουθησαν
	εν εαυτοις	οχλοι πολλοι
	9 σου αι αμαρτιαι	26 παρ αυτης
	17 ουκ] ου γαρ	29 ιαται] ιαθη
	18 οι οι 2°	40 *παντας
	οι οι 4°	41 κουμ
	25 επεινασε και αυτος	vi. 2 *οι οτι
	26 οι του ante αρχιερεως	5 τας χειρας επιθεις
iii.	7 ηκολουθουν	8 την οδον
	10 αψωνται αυτου	11 οσοι εαν
	οι οσοι ειχαν μαστιγας	15 *οι η
	12 *φανερον αυτον	16 απο των νεκρων
	17 αυτον του Ιακωβου	17 *οι τη ante φυλακη
	21 οι παρ] περι	20 και ακουων
	27 *οι δυναται ουδεις] ουδεις	22 αιτησον μοι
	δυναται	29 εν μνημειω
	28 αι βλασφημαι	33 *οι οι οχλοι
	32 και αι αδελφαι σου post	αυτους 2°] αυτου
	αδελφοι σου	34 *ο Ιησους ειδεν
	35 μητηρ + μου	35 πολλης ωρας
iv.	4 οι του ουρανου	*λεγουσιν + αυτω
	8 εν . . . εν . . . εν	44 *οι ωσει
	11 *δεδοται] + μονοις	45 βηθσαιδα
	15 οι οι	*τους οχλους
	18 *οι ουτοι εισιν 2°	46 ανηλθεν
	20 εν . . . εν . . . εν	47 τω μεσω
	21 επι] υπο	οι της ante θαλασσης
	*επιτεθη] τεθη	54 οι επιγνοντες
	24 τοις ακουουσιν και προστε-	vii. 3 νιψονται
	θησεται υμιν	8 πολλα τοιαυτα
	31 κοκκον	11 *οι εαν
	33 οι πολλαις	19 *εκπορευεται] εκβαλλεται

- vii. 22 **ασελγειαι*
 24 *ορια*
 **ομ την*
 25 **ομ αυτης*
 **προς] εις*
 26 **συροφοινικισσα*
εκβαλη
 27 **εστι καλον*
 33 *επιλαβομενος*
αυτον] αυτου
 35 *γλωττης*
 36 **διεστελλετο αυτοις*
εκηρυττον
 37 *εξεπληττοντο*
- viii. 1 **ομ ο Ιησους*
 **ειπεν*
 5 **αρτους εχετε*
ειπον αυτω
 7 **αυτα ευλογησας*
 9 *δε + και*
 10 **εμβας ευθεως*
 17 *υμων την καρδιαν*
 18 *ομ και 2°*
 19 *οτε] οταν*
 20 *ειπον + αυτω*
 22 **βηθσαιδα*
 23 *ηρωτα*
 24 **οτι ως] ωσει*
**ομ ορω*
 25 *ανεβλεψε*
 31 **των αρχιερεων*
**των γραμματεων*
 33 *στραφεις*
 35 **ομ οντος*
 38 *εαν*
- ix. 2 **ομ τον 2° et 3°*
 3 *εγενοντο*
**κναφευς*
 6 *λαλησει*
αυτοις] αυτους
 7 **ομ λεγουσα*
- 13 **ομ οτι*
 14 **μαθητας αυτου*
 17 **ειπεν αυτω*
 19 **αποκριθεις λεγει αυτω*
 22 **υδωρ*
 25 **ο οχλος*
 30 *επορευοντο*
 33 *ηλθον*
 38 **απεκριθη Ιωαννης και ειπεν*
αυτω
**επι τω ονοματι*
**δαιμονια εκβαλλοντα*
**ομ οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν*
 39 **εν τω ονοματι*
 40 *καθ' ημων*
υπερ ημων
 41 **οτι ου μη*
 42 **ος εαν*
μικρων τουτων
**μυλος ονικος*
περι] επι
 45 *εστιν σε*
 50 **αλας εν εαυτοις*
- x. 1 **ομ δια του*
 8 **σαρξ μια*
 13 **αυτων αψηται*
 16 *ευλογει*
 17 *γονυπετησας αυτω*
 21 **ομ τοις*
 24 **ομ τοις 2°*
 25 **ομ της 1°*
**διελθειν 1°*
 27 *ομ τω 1°*
 29 **και αποκριθεις (ομ δε)*
**ενεκεν του εναγγελιου*
 31 **ομ οι*
 32 *αυτους] αυτων*
οι ακολουθουντες
 33 **ομ τοις ante γραμματευσι*
 35 **ομ οι*
 36 **ποιησαι με] ινα ποιησω*

- x. 40 *ομ μου post ευωρυμων
 42 *λεγει] ειπεν
 43 *ουτως
 *υμων διακονος
 44 αν] εαν
 *υμων] εν υμιν
 *γενεσθαι] ειναι
 46 ο νιος
 47 *ομ ο ante νιος
 51 *ραββονι
- xi. 1 ιεροσολυμα
 *βηθσφαγη
 3 *αποστελλει αυτον
 4 *ομ τον
 6 καθως] καθα
 add αυτοις ante ο Ιησους
 7 *επ αυτον
 8 *εγ τη οδω 1°
 *στιβαδας
 17 *λεγων αυτοις] αυτους λεγων
 21 *εξηραται
 22 *ο Ιησους
 26 τα παραπτωματα υμων]
 υμιν
 27 *ομ παλιν
 28 και τις] η τις
 εδωκεν την εξουσιαν ταυτην
 31 *διελογιζοντο
 *προς εαυτους] εν εαυτους
 *ομ ουν
 32 φοβουμεθα
 παντες
 εχουσιν
 ομ ουτως
- xii. 6 *ομ αυτον
 9 *τον αμπελωνα εκδωσει
 11 ημων] υμων
 17 *αποδοτε ουν
 18 *μη ειναι αναστασιν
 23 τη αναστασει ουν
 25 *ομ οι
- 26 *τοι βατον
 27 *ομ θεος 2°
 29 ημων] υμων
 30 πρωτη + και μεγαλη
 31 *σεαυτον] εαυτον
 32 *ομ θεος
 36 *εν πνευματι αγιω λεγει
 37 ηκουον
- xiii. 1 *εις εκ των
 2 *αποκριθεις ο Ιησους
 4 *ταυτα παντα
 8 αρχη
 10 *ευαγγελιον + εις μαρτυριον
 αυτης
 16 *ομ εις τα οπισω
 18 *χειμωνος + μηδε σαββατω
 19 *ομ τοιαυτη
 21 ομ η ante ιδου
 27 *εκ] απο
 30 *μεχρις] εως
 ταυτα παντα
 31 παρελευσεται
 32 ομ δε
 και] η
 ομ της ante ωρας
 ομ οι 2°
 36 υμας] ημας
- xiv. 1 αποκτεινουσιν
 3 ομ τη
 *αλαβαστρον μυρον εχουσα
 5 *ομ τοις
 6 *εις εμε] εν εμοι
 7 τους πτωχους γαρ παντοτε
 *ομ και οταν . . . ποιησαι
 8 εσχεν
 9 οπου εαν
 11 αργυρια
 12 *ομ ημερα
 14 *ομ οτι
 15 ανωγαιον
 ημιν] υμιν

xiv. 16	ομ αυτου	xv. 2	ειπεν] λεγει
20	ομ εκ	14	*ομ vers
25	γενηματος	17	*στεφανον ακανθινον
30	*συ σημερον αλεκτορα δις	18	*ο βασιλευς
32	*γετσιμανη	22	*τον γολγοθαν
33	*ομ τον ante Ιακωβον	24	διαμεριζονται
35	προσελθων επι προσωπον ante επι της γης	31	ομ δε
41	*ομ το ante λοιπον	32	αυτον] αυτω
43	*ο Ιουδας ομ των ante γραμματεων	34	*λιμα
45	*αυτω λεγει αυτω	36	*εις εξ αυτων
51	ηκολουθησεν	37	*αφεις] κραξας
61	ο δε Ιησους	39	*ουτως
62	*εκ δεξιων καθημενον	43	*ηλθεν] ελθων
65	*προφητευσον ημιν χριστε τις εστιν ο πταισας σε	47	η Ιωση
68	ουτε	xvi. 1	*ομ η του
71	καταθεματιζειν ομυνναι	2	του μνημειον
72	*το ρημα ο	8	*ομ ταχυ
		9	*δε + ο Ιησους *σαββατων
		13	ανηγγειλαν
		14	*υστερον δε
		18	βλαψη

From a text reconstructed on the basis of this collation, Cod. 1385 shows only the following variants:

- iii. 5 απεκατεσταθη
- vii. 3 νιψωνται (with the Textus Receptus)
- xiii. 36 ημας] υμας (with the Textus Receptus)

Cod. 1173 shows the following variants:

ii. 20	ηηστευουσιν	34	ομ αυτον 1°
22	σκους (pro ασκους)	xiii. 8	ομ γαρ
iii. 17	οι νιοι	xiv. 9	μνημοσυνον] μοσυνον
v. 33	ειδουσα	32	γεθσιμανη
vi. 15	ομ οτι ηλιας . . . ελεγον	xv. 32	αυτον] αυτον (with the Textus Receptus)
xi. 14	φαγη	xvi. 1	add η ante Ιακωβον
xii. 33	καρδιας και εξ ολης της συ- νεσεως in rasura		

Cod. 1169 shows the following variants:

ii. 8	om <i>ταυτα</i>	x. 30	om <i>και</i> ante <i>αδελφους</i>
18	<i>νηστευσιν</i>	xi. 15	om <i>τους</i>
iv. 3	om <i>ακονετε</i>		om <i>τας</i> ante <i>περιστερας</i>
31	<i>απεως</i>	xii. 9	<i>ποιη</i>
v. 12	om <i>τους</i>	xiii. 32	om <i>δε</i>
vi. 15	om <i>δε</i>	xiv. 4	om <i>και</i> ante <i>λεγοντες</i>
30	om <i>αυτω</i>	xv. 36	<i>και</i> <i>περιθεις τε</i>
45	om <i>το</i> ante <i>πλοιον</i>	38	om <i>απο</i>
viii. 17	<i>ουπω]</i> <i>ουπου</i>	39	<i>του θεου</i>
33	om <i>τα</i> 2°	47	om <i>η</i> ante <i>Iωση</i> (with the Textus Receptus)
ix. 19	om <i>εως ποτε προς υμας</i> <i>εσομαι</i>	xvi. 18	om <i>τι</i> om <i>αυτους</i>
25	<i>συντρεχει</i>		

The most striking feature of the text of Mark in these codices is the remarkable uniformity of the three. In the whole gospel, 1385 departs in only three readings from the text supported by both of the others — so that it is almost certain that this is the archetype of the group. Of these three variants, the first conflicts with the usual minuscule text and may have been independently corrected in the two copies; the others are merely coincidence in common misspellings. Both 1169 and 1173 show a number of variations from the family type — individual peculiarities which are either careless mistakes or the substitution of another reading familiar to the scribe. Even in 1169 and 1173, however, the variation from the family text is negligible, since 1169 has all but one of the family readings and 1173 all but four.

But if 1385 is probably the archetype of the group, it is even more certain that neither 1169 nor 1173 is copied from the other. The amount of individual variation in each and the almost complete absence of readings in which they agree against 1385 makes this plain. Both are copied from 1385.

The text of 1204 is more complicated. The collation of Mark xi made five years ago showed that 1204 belonged with the three Patmos manuscripts, although forming a less trustworthy representative of the family text than any of the others. The more complete study made in 1930, as can be seen from the readings marked with an asterisk and from the 'singular' readings of 1204 given below, shows that before Mark vii. 19, where the character of the text abruptly changes, 1204 is not a representative of the group at all. Thenceforward most



The Baptism of Christ by John
The Evangelist Mark

Χριστοφόρη Φαντί



ΤΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΟΝΕΔΙΛΟΙ
μητρούειαντλουιυχυγό^{το}
τηνθο. εις ειρηνημέτοι
ωροφή Ταν. ιδουτζώ πό^{το}
τάλφ διάλλελού μου πρό^{το}
παρασώ ποωσυ. οδηγήτα
σκινάστι. Τερόδ σκινασέμπρο
σβενσου. φωνή ποιητήμ
της γίνεται. ζήτηδοιτι

Patmos 274 (Gregory 1385; von Soden 1304)
Opening verses of the Gospel of Mark

of its variants are those of the family, but it has fewer such than the other mss. have. That is, it has been more completely corrected toward the Ecclesiastical Text. Before vii. 19 it only shares with the family those readings which are common to most manuscripts and its archetype was perhaps a weak and unimportant representative of the Alexandrian Text. The greater portion of its variants from the Textus Receptus represent the real Ecclesiastical Text. In addition it has a large number of readings not shared by the family. It is, therefore, evident that while the latter part of the Gospel of Mark was copied from a manuscript belonging to the Patmos family, the archetype of the earlier part did not have this character.

The following readings in 1204 are not those of the family:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| i. 10 καταβαινον ωσει περιστε- | 31 αδελφοι αυτου |
| ραν | 32 περι αυτον οχλος πολυς |
| 12 εκβαλλει αυτον το πνευμα | 34 ιδου |
| 21 εισπορευεται | iv. 7 εις] επι |
| 30 του Σιμωνος | 9 om αυτοις |
| 31 ευθεως αφηκεν αυτην ο πυ- | 20 om και παραδεχονται |
| ρετος | 22 om τι |
| 34 + ειναι τον χριστον | 32 σπαρη] αυξηθη |
| 40 om αυτον 3° | 34 και χωρις |
| 42 η λεπρα απ αυτου | v. 2 ανθρωπος εκ των μνημειων |
| 43 αυτω] αυτον | 4 ισχυειν αυτον |
| om ευθεως | 5 εν τοις μνημασι και εν τοις |
| ii. 1 εισηλθεν παλιν | ορεσιν |
| 8 αυτοι διαλογιζονται | 7 ειπε] λεγει |
| 10 επι της γης αφιεναι | 9 απεκριθη λεγων] λεγι αυτω |
| 14 παραγων ο Ιησους | 11 αγελη χοιρων μεγαλη προς |
| 21 ακναφου | τω ορει |
| 26 iερευσι μονοις | 12 om εις τους χοιρους |
| 27 συν] μετ | 18 εμβαινοντος |
| iii. 4 εν τοις | 19 ο δε Ιησους] και |
| 11 εθεωρουν αυτον | 28 γαρ + εν εαυτη |
| προσεπιπτον | 36 ακουσας ευθεως |
| εκραζον | 37 συνανακολουθησαι αυτω |
| ο χριστος ο υιος | 39 τι κλαιετε και θορυβεισθε |
| 17 τον Ιακωβον] αυτου | 42 εξεστησαν οι γονεις αυτης |
| 26 εφ εαυτον ανεστη | vi. 2 ακοθησαντες |
| 28 τοις υιοις των ανθρωπων] | εξεπλησσοντο επι τη διδαχη |
| τοις ανθρωποις | αυτου |

vi.	3	Ιουδα και Ιωση	ομ τα παραπτωματα . . .
	4	συγγενεσι αντου	26 νμιν
	14	αι δυναμεις ενεργουσιν	xii. 23 ομ ουν
	15	αλλοι 1°] + δε	41 εβαλλον] εφερον
	18	γυναικα φιλιππου	xiii. 11 μεριμνατε
	37	δηναριων διακοσιων	19 ομ εως του ννν
	45	προαγειν αυτον	33 και της] η
vii.	15	ομ εστιν	35 η μεσονυκτιου
	23	ταυτα παντα	xiv. 65 ομ τινες
x.	19	ομ μη φονευσης	xv. 24 διεμεριζονται
	25	ομ της 2°	39 ομ δε
xi.	10	ομ ερχομενη	του θεου
	18	απολεσωσιν	40 ομ και ante μαρια 1°
	25	αφησει	

In the latter part of Mark this manuscript may, like the others, be a copy of 1385. Or, perhaps more probably, both 1385 and 1204 may be copies of a lost original, possibly once at Sinai — though the investigations of Professor Lake in 1927 show that there is no longer any other ms. of this type either there or at Patmos. In any case 1204 can not have been copied from 1169 or 1173, since it has none of the variants peculiar to them.

None of these manuscripts are as interesting textually as they are palaeographically. Fundamentally they represent the Ecclesiastical Text, with a fair sprinkling of aberrant readings. But, as can be plainly seen from the number of singular readings in 1169 and 1173, these are no more numerous than usual — mistakes, unconscious harmonization to parallels, deliberate correction to accord with the familiar text remembered from the services. No manuscript can be expected to be more than an approximate representative of the text of its group, and each copy was a little less like its original ancestor. In the text of this Patmos Family occasional variants occur which are attested by each of the established texts, but the process of mixture has been incidental, not deliberate. This is shown by an examination in detail of the attestation for the variants from the family text found in each manuscript. It is of just the same nature as the attestation for the readings of the family as a whole — Neutral, Western, Alexandrian, Caesarean, and so on, and in many cases the variants are otherwise wholly unattested.

SILVA NEW

BICHL, OBERBAYERN

ON JOSEPHUS'S STATEMENT OF THE PHARISEES'
DOCTRINE OF FATE (ANTIQ. XVIII. 1, 3)

[The following note by Dr. H. St. John Thackeray was found among the papers of Professor George F. Moore. It relates to a sentence from Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 1, 3, discussed by Moore in his *Judaism*, I, pp. 457 f.; III, pp. 139 f., and in an article in this REVIEW for October 1929, and it is here published by the kind permission of Mrs. Thackeray.

The Greek text of the sentence in question runs as follows in Niese's edition:

πράσσεσθαι τε είμαρμένη τὰ πάντα ἀξιούντες οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπέου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται δοκήσαν τῷ θεῷ κρίσιν (v. 1. κρᾶσιν) γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἑκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῷ ἔθελήσαντι προσχωρεῖν μετ' ἀρετῆς ή κακίας.]

JOSEPHUS, ANT. JUD. XVIII. 1, 3. § 13

While maintaining that all things are brought about by Fate, they yet do not deprive the human will of the impulse to do them, it having pleased God that there should be a coalition¹ between Fate's council-chamber² and such men as choose to associate with it, with virtuous or vicious intent.³

¹ κρᾶσιν. ‘Transcriptional probability’ (Hort’s phrase) confirms this reading: κρᾶσιν would not have been altered to κρᾶσιν. But I find no other example of κρᾶσις in Josephus. I take it to mean a ‘blending’ or ‘fusion,’ perhaps ‘copartnership.’ The following καὶ . . . καὶ . . . means (I think) ‘both . . . and . . .’ (not ‘. . . , and . . . and . . .’): there is a coming together open to both parties (Fate and man).

² βουλευτηρίον in Josephus = (1) *Council-chamber*, of the Roman senate-house *Ant.* xiv. 270, xix. 60, of meeting-place of the Sanhedrin, *B. J.* vi. 354; (2) *Council* or *meeting of council*, *Ant.* xvii. 38 (|| συνόδους), 280 β. ἡγερ ἐπὶ τοῖς ποιητέοις, xviii. 13, *B. J.* iv. 243. I translate ‘council-chamber’ above, strictly ‘meeting of council.’

³ “choose to join it (fall into line with it, or enter its council-chamber) actuated by virtue or vice.” προσχωρεῖν μετὰ . . . cannot (like προσχωρεῖν πρὸς . . .) mean “take the side of virtue or of vice,” as I once erroneously translated it. [A remote parallel occurs in Herodotus viii. 60 fin. μὴ δὲ οἰκότα βουλευομένοισι, οὐκ ἔθέλει οὐδὲ δ θεὸς προσχωρέειν πρὸς τὰς ἀνθρωπῆτας γνώμας, ‘But when (men) in their counsels reject reason, God does not choose to follow the wanderings of human fancies,’ Rawlinson.]

If man comes in μετὰ κακίας, Fate will not interfere but will let his destiny have its course: if μετ’ ἀρετῆς, Fate goes half way to meet him.

H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY



Dug by the late Mr. J. G. Evans.

THE TEMPLE OF SAREQUT EL GADEN.
Peninsula of Sinai.

The Temple of Hathor

From a drawing by Gen. de Langle.

PLATE I